SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Albert A. Pattashnick, executive vice president, Talmudical Academy of Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

אביו שבשמים

Our Heavenly Father, we seek Thy guidance and Thy blessing at this hour when men of ill will and evil design promote the arts of war in remote corners of this earth's scarred surface. Serious is the challenge that freedom-loving America faces when the blood of her sons is shed on the field of battle.

O Thou, who hast been the inspiration of our fathers in ages past, when they sought to establish upon this continent a nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the dignity and freedom of each individual human being, guide us also aright, that we seek peace, but not flinch from the onslaughts of godless, ruthless, and unprincipled aggressors.

While we must develop superior military might and diplomatic acumen, we must also be filled with Thy holy spirit. Our fathers faced greater odds in their day, with fewer allies at their side and more meager resources at their disposal; yet, sustained by Thee, they were not dismayed, and victory perched upon their banners.

To win friends among wavering nations and to influence those on our side to continue to side with us, we must manifest by our own righteous conduct the loftiness of the American dream. In our relations with one another, may we ever remember that all of us are Thy children, equally dependent upon Thee. Despite differences of race, creed, and ethnic origin, bring us together into an indissoluble bond of friendship and brotherhood, that, unitedly, we may promote the welfare of our country and increase the happiness of our fellow men.

Grant, O God, abiding courage, faith, and wisdom to our Chief Executive, President Lyndon B. Johnson, the Members of this august body, and all others who are charged with the great responsibility of directing the affairs of our Nation. Hasten the day when the millennial hope of universal peace will prevail throughout the world, with liberty and justice for all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, June 16, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Lt. Gen. Frederic Joseph Brown, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be lieutenant general on the retired list, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee on conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 7750) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MORGAN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYS, Mr. O'HARA of Illinois, Mr. ADAIR, Mr. MAILLIARD, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6927) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 442) authorizing the Clerk of the House to make a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 8371, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H.R. 214. An act to amend section 2104 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the time for filing certain claims for mustering-out payments, and, effective July 1, 1966, to repeal chapter 43 of title 38 of the United States Code;

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7717. An act to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7762. An act to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, with respect to the Reserve Officers' Training Corps; and

H.R. 8464. An act to provide, for the period beginning on July 1, 1965, and ending on June 30, 1966, a temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 6927) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request by Mrs. NEUBERGER, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF CHANGE IN TIME FOR RECEPTION OF ASTRONAUTS AND ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, it is my understanding that the reception planned for the astronauts in room 207 will not be until 1:30 p.m. The information given to me prior to 10 o'clock this morning was that it would be at 1 o'clock; the Senate, therefore, would stand in recess from 12:30 to 1 p.m.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint leadership be empowered to call for a recess at any time between 1 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. for the purpose of receiving the astronauts.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is it still planned that the Senate will proceed to vote on the adoption of Senate Resolution 107, authorizing the printing of the 67th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document, before the reception for the astronauts?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is our intention, unless too many speeches intervene during the morning hours.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 1817. A bill to amend the District of Columbia public assistance law to clarify

the categories of federally aided assistance recipients (Rept. No. 3335).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2153. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 2154. A bill to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2155. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2156. A bill to provide for the sale of certain mineral rights to William Sima and Thelma L. Sima, in Minnesota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McGOVERN (for himself and Mr. NELSON):

S. 2157. A bill to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. McGOVERN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2158. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. COOPER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself and Mr. BURDICK):

S. 2159. A bill to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to determine and make necessary changes in certain freight rates and charges for the transportation of certain agricultural commodities affecting the western district of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

MEDICAL CARE FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes.

The text of this measure was transmitted to the Congress by an executive communication from the Department of the Interior, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter explaining the proposed legislation and the need for it be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the text of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2153) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to provide from any funds available for the work being performed, emergency medical attention for employees of the Department of the Interior located in isolated areas who became disabled because of illness or injury not attributable to official work, including the moving of such employees to hospitals or other places where medical assistance is available, and in case of death to remove the bodies of deceased employees to the nearest place where they can be prepared for shipment or for burial. When a transient without permanent residence, or any other person while away from his place of residence, is employed on a temporary or seasonal basis by the Department of the Interior and while so employed becomes disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work, he may be provided hospitalization and other necessary medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed fifteen days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from any funds available for the work for which such person is employed.

SEC. 2. Appropriations of the Department of the Interior available for the work being performed may be utilized for payment to temporary or seasonal employees for loss of time due to injury in official work at rates not in excess of those provided by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. 751), when the injured person is in need of immediate financial assistance to avoid hardship: *Provided,* That such payment shall not be made for a period in excess of fifteen days and the Secretary of Labor shall be notified promptly of the amount so paid, which amount shall be deducted from the amount, if any, otherwise payable from the Employees' Compensation Fund to the employee on account of the injury. When any person assisting in the suppression of range, forest, and tundra fires or in other emergency work under the direction of the Department of the Interior without compensation from the United States, pursuant to the terms of a contract, agreement, or permit, is injured in such work, the Department may furnish hospitalization and other medical care, subsistence, and lodging for a period of not to exceed fifteen days during such disability, the cost thereof to be payable from the appropriations applicable to the work out of which the injury occurred, except that this proviso shall not apply when such person is within the purview of a State or other compensation act: *Provided further,* That determination by the Department of the Interior that payment is allowable under this section shall be final as to payments made hereunder, but such determination or payments with respect to employees shall not prevent the Secretary of Labor from denying further payments should he determine that compensation is not properly allowable under the provisions of the Employees' Compensation Act.

SEC. 3. No payment shall be made pursuant to this Act for any hospitalization or medical services for injury or illness not attributable to official work on behalf of a sick or injured person who is covered by an enrollment or who is not excluded from enrollment by virtue of his current employment in a plan under the Federal Employee's Health Benefits Act of 1959, as amended (5 U.S.C. 3001).

SEC. 4. This Act shall not apply to employees of the Federal or territorial governments in Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands while serving in any such area.

The letter presented by Mr. JACKSON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., May 17, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to use appropriated funds for the payment of medical care of temporary and seasonal employees and employees located in isolated areas who become disabled because of injury or illness not attributable to official work.

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill is identical in substance to the medical provisions of the act of March 3, 1925, 43 Stat. 1133, 16 U.S.C. 557 (1958), as amended by sections 15 and 16 of the act of April 24, 1950, 64 Stat. 86, 16 U.S.C. 580j (1958). These acts authorize the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture to provide medical and other care to certain of its employees whose circumstances of employment are similar to those of the employees of this Department whom we hope to see benefited by the bill. The bill will not apply to Federal or territorial government employees in Guam, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The medical attention contemplated by the bill is medical attention of an emergency nature. At present, the Department has no authority to pay to have a sick or injured employee who is located in an isolated area removed to a hospital when the sickness or injury occurs outside the scope of his employment. Similarly, the Department presently has no authority to bring medical help to such an employee. The employees affected are located in isolated areas for the purpose of carrying out the Department's programs. Consequently, we believe that we should provide them with emergency medical care. The bill would not authorize the construction of medical facilities nor the employment of medical or technical personnel.

Like the Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and other bureaus of this Department annually employ transients and other temporary personnel for fire suppression activities and other emergency programs. We also employ trained, organized Indian, Spanish-American, or Eskimo crews from the Southwest, Montana, and Alaska. In the course of their employment, these crews are transported many miles from their places of residence, very often for prolonged periods. During such periods of absence from their homes, these employees sometimes contract colds, flu or other illnesses requiring medical attention not as a result of the performance of their official duties.

Under existing law, medical care not covered by Bureau of Employees' Compensation regulations and not provided by the Public Health Service has to be paid for by the employee, unless the employing agency has authority to meet the obligation. In most cases, transient personnel are unable to pay their own medical expenses. While local physicians have been very cooperative in providing emergency medical attention to our transient employees when required, we believe that the moral obligation to provide for the welfare of these employees rests with the employing agency.

Historically, the cases coming to our attention which would fall within the purview of the proposed bill have been relatively few in number. However, more transient or temporary personnel are being employed now than formerly because of more intensive management of the lands under the jurisdiction of this Department. During the 1964 fire season the Bureau of Land Management alone hired over 2,000 temporary employees. Consequently, we anticipate that the problem of medical care for these temporary employees will become greater.

Section 3 of the bill is designed to bar dual payment for medical treatment authorized in the first two sections and to encourage employees to join such plans. It provides that no payment shall be made for medical services rendered to an employee who is covered by a Federal employee's health benefits plan, or who is not excluded from enrollment in such a plan.

As previously noted, the authority sought in the proposed bill for the Secretary of the Interior is already enjoyed by the Secretary of Agriculture in the management of the Forest Service. The enactment of this proposed legislation, then, would equalize the employment practices of the Government in regard to the classes of employees affected.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

D. OTIS BEASLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO ESTABLISH THE UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

The purpose of this bill is merely to extend the time for submission of the Commission's report and to increase the authorization for funds necessary to complete the work of the Commission.

This bill was submitted and recommended by the Chairman of the Commission with the approval of the Bureau of the Budget.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks the letter to the President of the Senate in explanation of the bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2154) to amend the act establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico, introduced by Mr. JACKSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letter presented by Mr. Jackson is as follows:

UNITED STATES-PUERTO RICO COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF PUERTO RICO,
Washington-San Juan, June 9, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Enclosed are two copies of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 86-271 (78 Stat. 17), establishing the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico (enclosure A).

We recommend that this proposed legislation be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted. I am also enclosing a copy of the present law showing the changes which would be effected by the proposed amendatory legislation (enclosure B).

The amendment would do two things: (1) Extend the date for the submission of the Commission's report from January 1966 until September 30, 1966 and (2) increase by $215,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated. A similar extension of time and increase in funds will also be authorized by the Commonwealth.

The extension of time is required because the election campaigns in 1964 both here and in Puerto Rico prevented the Commission from getting to work as quickly as had been hoped. After the elections the composition of the Commission changed. Two Senators, a Congressman, and the former Governor of Puerto Rico were appointed to replace outgoing members of the Commission.

The additional funds are required partly because of this extension of time and partly because the scope of the program of studies finally adopted by the Commission was broader than originally estimated. As the enclosed copy of the Commission's program of studies indicates (enclosure C), 16 major studies have been adopted by the Commission. They reflect the deep interest of the three contending status viewpoints represented on the Commission (Commonwealth, statehood, and independence) in a comprehensive study of all major factors affecting the present and future relationship between Puerto Rico and the United States.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES H. ROWE, JR.

FOOD FOR PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT — THE INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT OF 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference for myself and Senator NELSON of Wisconsin, a bill to commit the United States to a major war against want.

I have been convinced for some time that the United States has the formula—excess agricultural production capacity and agricultural know-how—to defeat hunger in the world.

I am increasingly convinced that a war against want will do more to encourage peaceful progress in the less developed areas of the world and strengthen them against Communist agitation than any other step we can take. I believe that in the last 20 years America's agricultural abundance has done more to stem the tide of communism than has any other overseas aid. But in a world of hunger and misery we can and ought to do much more to use our food abundance as an instrument of progress, peace, and hope.

FOOD SHORTAGE AND THE DOMINICAN CRISIS

Al Peterson, head of CARE operations in the Dominican Republic, was in Washington recently to report on the situation in that island Nation. He presented a proposal to double their program which has been providing food for 250,000 preschoolchildren and 250,000 schoolchildren, pregnant mothers, disabled and aged adults.

Listening to the situation as described by Peterson, one realizes that a lack of adequate food is basic to the unrest which has led to the Dominican crisis and many other tensions in the world. One out of every five children born in the Dominican Republic dies from malnutrition. One out of each of the four remaining children is handicapped for life, mentally or physically or both, for lack of a proper diet in the formative years of life. Parents—good parents—cannot be expected to sit and watch their children die without protest or effort to change their lot.

Because of the tropical climate, the Dominican Republic could produce food crops the year around, one following another. For most of the year, however, drought makes production impossible. The Dominicans normally get one crop a year. This year, unusually severe drought has shortened that one crop so these already underfed people—600,000 of them unemployed—face abnormally intense food shortages for the next year or 18 months.

It was in the face of this bleak food outlook and massive unemployment that the current upheaval in political life, accompanied by bloodshed, took place.

Significantly, CARE operations in the nation have been alowed to continue by both sides in the revolution. The junta radio and the rebel radio have been available to CARE personnel to broadcast notices that the children who want their CARE food can get it at all the usual places. Junta supporters and rebel supporters have volunteered their services to keep schools open to feed the children. In the capital city the number of children fed increased from 25,000 to about 35,000 to care for children cut off from normal private sources of food by the revolution.

CARE'S PROPOSALS

CARE wants to double its child-feeding program and provide food for approximately a million children in all. It is also seeking well-drilling equipment, garden seeds, hand tools and small power tools so it can increase the 400 irrigated school gardens which it has developed, worked by the children, to a total of 3,400. The children get an average of 1,000 pounds of vegetables from the present gardens for each $2-seed packet supplied to them.

The 400 gardens already established are in areas where groundwater for irrigation can be obtained at 20 or 25 feet below the surface from dug wells. Elsewhere, water ranges to 180 feet below the surface, requiring drilling equipment.

The Dominicans have tried desperately to feed themselves, so desperately they have burned off forests and ruined much of their land seeking space to produce a little more food to halt their hunger. Wells and reservoirs to provide irrigation water might permit the production of a series of crops through the year if methods known to us in the United States were introduced. With food and better health, and a new vigor, the Dominicans will more readily advance their standard of living.

Catholic Relief Services, the great overseas relief arm of the Catholic Church which has distributed American food all over the world, is also carrying on a significant family feeding program that now reaches 206,000 Dominicans. A somewhat smaller but important program is conducted by Church World Service.

FOOD FOR PEACEFUL DEVELOPMENT

The Dominican nation offers us an opportunity to create a Western Hemisphere showcase of a new American food for peaceful development program if we determine to make it that.

But we must create more than one showcase, or even several.

We should export food produced on our presently idle and diverted farm acres and use it just as widely as it can be effectively used to banish want and to end the unrest of peoples who now, as in Dominica, have to watch their children die. It should be done in Vietnam—North Vietnam as well as South Vietnam, if they will accept it—and all of the crucial areas of hunger in Asia, Latin America, and Africa. Food for peaceful development can contain the fires of unrest before they are kindled in the tinder of want. It is a far better weapon than a bomber in our competition with the Communists for influence in the developing world.

President Johnson's proposal at Johns Hopkins University on April 7 for a regional Mekong development plan in southeast Asia includes a highly significant food component. Through this imaginative proposal, American food can be used not only in direct feeding operations but as capital to pay the wages of workers and farmers engaged in the construction of irrigation units, roads, schools, and other rural and community development projects.

After briefly reviewing the military and political faces of the current war in Vietnam in a great speech on May 13, President Johnson said:

> The third face of war in Vietnam is, at once, the most tragic and most hopeful. It is the face of human need. It is the untended sick, the hungry family, and the illiterate child. It is men and women, many without shelter, with rags for clothing, struggling for survival in a very rich and a very fertile land. It is the most important battle in which we are engaged.

I agree strongly with President Johnson that the war against want is "the most important battle." I have deep misgivings about our growing military involvement in Vietnam because I do not believe that the problems of that area can be solved by military means. We can, however, win the war against want far better than the Communists can, and that is the war I hope we will press around the globe.

THE FOOD AND NUTRITION ACT

The purpose of the act I have introduced is to authorize a 10-year war against want, using the excess agricultural production capacity of our own Nation to eliminate hunger while we are assisting the less developed nations to bring their productivity and their populations into balance.

The bill authorizes a gradual increasing program starting at $500 million in fiscal year 1966 in addition to present programs. The funds would be appropriated to the President to buy domestic agricultural products, including high protein and enriched foods, to be sold, exchanged, or donated to nations without sufficient nutritional supplies for their citizens.

It is my own hope and belief that not all of the authorized funds would have to be appropriated because other nations would participate and because, if we effectively expand rural development assistance in the recipient countries, the requirements of many of them would soon begin to decline, as the requirements of the Dominicans would decline rather rapidly, if we couple our food aid with a peaceful development program.

The early steps in our war against want would necessarily involve improvement of food distribution facilities in many of the less developed countries where they are lacking, and upgrading the nutritional value of the foods we provide.

The bill authorizes the President to allocate funds for loans and grants to recipient countries to improve their port facilities, storage and internal transport where there is need so our foods can be used effectively and efficiently without waste. It authorizes use of the Peace Corps and American technicians in developing efficient distribution as well as payments for preserving and processing foods prior to export into storable and distributable form. It authorizes the provision of utensils, implements, and other items necessary to effective distribution and to the rural economic development programs conducted by this country and by the voluntary agencies—such as CARE's program in Dominica—to assist countries in producing more of their own needs.

The authorization in the bill is for appropriations to the President, who working through an International Food and Nutrition Director—perhaps an expanded role of our existing food for peace office—could allocate funds to the Department of Agriculture or to the Agency for International Development to acquire foods, have them processed, distribute them, and speed rural development, as is appropriate to the role of each of those agencies.

BENEFICIAL EFFECTS AT HOME

One of the greatest benefits of the program would be to the United States itself. It would allow us to ease restrictions on agricultural production of all kinds here at home. The use of high-protein meats, poultry, and other products—not just surpluses—would permit the spread of this benefit with some equity among American producers, and strengthen the whole farm economy.

We are today losing about 100,000 farming units each year in the United States because of low incomes. Low incomes are a result of both low prices and restricted production. Increased production, even at the present moderate price levels, will help strengthen our farm economy and slow the disappearance of farms. This will help to end the deterioration of the economies of our rural communities, release an agricultural demand for equipment and other manufactured supplies, and benefit the entire national economy.

I know that some Members of Congress are reluctant to assist less developed nations in the production of crops which might compete with us for export markets. One of the consequences of this reluctance, in my opinion, has been an overemphasis in our assistance programs on too highly sophisticated public works and industrial development projects in nations not yet ready for them. Sound industrial growth and progress is almost impossible until a country has achieved a sound agricultural base and the people have the vigor of body and mind which result from proper diet. A necessary condition of sound industrial development is the release of some of the manpower now required for subsistence agriculture so that these men can engage in industry with their food supply assured.

We need to concentrate much more in the early phases of technical assistance programs on the introduction of improved food production methods—irrigation, fertilizers, pesticides, hybrid seeds, and other tested devices.

Eight out of every 10 persons on this planet still make their living from the land. Although an American farmer produces food for 30 of his fellow Americans, most of the world's farmers are unable to supply their own real food needs. As a consequence, two-thirds of the people of the world do not have proper nutrition. That stark fact is the chief barrier to human development abroad and an incalculable loss to our own prosperity and security.

AID BUILDS TRADE

Contrary to the fear of competition for export markets, the record shows that developing nations become increasingly good customers for American exports. Japan is the outstanding example. We helped Japan rebuild her agriculture as well as her industrial productivity following World War II. Her own production of agricultural products has increased, but she has also become America's best commercial customer for foodstuffs. Western Europe is another major example of this experience.

A recent study of 54 less developed countries showed that for each 10-percent increase in income, their purchases of agricultural exports from the United States went up 21 percent.

With world population expected to double by the year 2000, to 6 billion persons, our concern should not be primarily

the existence of markets for our products. We should be concerned with triggering economic development throughout the world so that tremendous population will be trading peacefully with us instead of creating a cauldron of misery and unrest in which peace is impossible. We should also be concerned that population measures are adopted which will stabilize this planet's human population at a reasonable level. In the long pull, we should be more alarmed about a demand for food so great it cannot be met than with guarding markets.

The final provisions of the bill that I have introduced authorize the President to establish necessary administrative machinery, an International Food and Nutrition Office or expanded food-for-peace office, and recommend and authorize expansion of such multilateral world food efforts as the United Nations Freedom from Hunger program. The cooperating nations have recommended that the experimental world food program which has grown out of the freedom from hunger campaign be expanded from its present $100 million operation to $275 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a table and an article from the Farm Index indicating the substantial contributions other countries are making in the assistance field. We are not alone in the effort. Other countries totally are doing about as much as the United States alone. I feel sure they will do more given leadership.

Such distinguished and highly successful development experts as Paul Hoffman, Director of the United Nations Special Fund, and Eugene Black, former Director of the World Bank, are convinced that aid should be increasingly funneled through international agencies. This device removes any basis for allegations of economic imperialism and intervention in other people's national affairs.

SUPPORT FOR FOOD AID

There is widespread support in the United States to expand food assistance programs along the lines I have suggested.

The 1964 farm policy report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission urged shipments of protein-rich foods, stating:

> Shipment of foods not in surplus under price support programs should be authorized. Nutritional needs of recipient countries require the use of nonsurplus food.

The Commission also urged a wider noninflationary use of local currencies accruing to the United States under the present food-for-peace program. In India and other countries such currencies might be used for educational or population control programs.

President Johnson has given strong support to the expression of existing foreign assistance programs to make fuller use of our farm goods in combating hunger around the world. At the Alfred E. Smith memorial dinner in October 1964, the President said:

> I do not believe that our island of abundance will be finally secured in a sea of despair and unrest, or in a world where even the oppressed may one day have access to the engines of modern destruction.
>
> Moreover, there is a great moral principle at stake. It is not right—in a world of such infinite possibilities—that children should die of hunger, that young people should live in ignorance, that men should be crippled by disease, that families should live in misery, shrouded in despair.
>
> If we truly mean our commitment to freedom, we must help strike at the conditions which make a mockery of that hope. Since President Truman announced the point 4 program we have extended the hand of compassion toward the world's oppressed.
>
> We will continue this help. But it is now clear that the tools we have developed will not do the job alone.
>
> I will propose steps to use the food and agricultural skills of the entire West in a joint effort to eliminate hunger and starvation.
>
> We have the skills and resources to improve the life of man. I do not believe we lack the imagination to find ways to shatter the barrier between man's capacity and man's needs.

THE NEED

The need for a war against want is reflected in a dozen surveys of world food and nutrition. More than half a billion people in today's world are chronically hungry. Some surveys put this at nearly a billion. At least another billion have poorly balanced diets. Together, they make up more than half of the 3 billion inhabitants of the globe. Lethargy, chronic illness and early death are their companions. Their average lifespan is about 30 years, which someone has said is "not very long to live but a long time to be hungry."

About 40 times as many children in undernourished families die before reaching the age of 5 as in well-fed nations such as the United States. One of the major causes of the annual death of an estimated 10 million infants from intestinal and respiratory diseases is lack of proper food.

Malnutrition also causes permanent handicaps. It not only restricts the physical development of children, but seriously limits their mental and emotional growth for life. They simply do not have the physical energy that makes learning and hard work possible. In this way hunger and ignorance contribute to low economic productivity as part of a vicious circle. Those lacking both energy and rudimentary education are unable to contribute to the income or the development of their nation. In Africa, Asia, and Latin America people live on average incomes of less than $100 a year compared with the U.S. average of $2,316.

The United States is uniquely qualified to lead the campaign against world hunger. While millions hunger, we struggle to meet the problem of surplus production and overeating. We discard enough food to feed well any one of fifty nations in the underdeveloped world. We pay our farmers enough for keeping surplus acreage idle to finance the shipping of millions of bushels of grain to hungry people overseas. We spend enough in storing and handling our annual surpluses to support a much expanded school lunch program overseas.

It is truly said that as a result of our farmers' labor we live with a crisis of abundance in a world of want. I can think of no more worthy purpose, no more humane or moral goal, than a dedicated effort to use our abundance to help other people.

PUBLIC LAW 480—"FOOD FOR PEACE"

Recognition of America's agricultural resources and the world's agricultural needs resulted in the passage in 1954 of the very important Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, Public Law 480. The legislative base of our food-for-peace program, Public Law 480, is an ingenious combination of self-interest and idealism. It was designed to assist American farmers and American taxpayers by providing an outlet for farm surpluses and an end to costly storage expenses. It was also a genuinely humanitarian effort to feed the hungry and promote the economic growth of the underdeveloped nations. There can be no doubt that it has been one of the most effective and popular programs ever authorized by Congress.

Originally, the Public Law 480 food-for-peace program had three titles, each of which offered a useful avenue to send our surplus foodstuffs to needy countries. In 1959 it was amended to add a fourth title authorizing sale of food on long-term, low-interest loans, as a consequence of some nations reaching a situation where they could afford to start to pay for all or part of their requirements on long terms.

Title I of Public Law 480 permits foreign governments to purchase American farm goods with their own currency at the market value of the product. The local currencies given to the United States are then largely granted or loaned back to the local government for economic development, mutual defense, and other purposes. In most countries about 80 percent of these so-called soft currencies have been used for such purposes. A smaller percentage has been used to develop commercial markets for American agricultural products, as loans to American businessmen overseas, and to support such programs as Fulbright fellowships, the translation of foreign journals, the U.S. Information Service, and maintenance of American embassies.

One-third of the entire American economic aid program now consists of food for peace, and 70 percent of the food-for-peace program has been undertaken under title I foreign currencies sales. It is an effective way to convert our farm surpluses and the currencies which they generate into classrooms, clinics, roads, and dams in the underdeveloped countries.

Title II of Public Law 480 authorizes our Government to make outright grants of food in emergencies or disasters. About $1.25 billion of commodities have been sent under this section to such areas as Algeria, Chile, and Yugoslavia, where the ravages of war and earthquakes or other natural disasters have threatened thousands of people with poverty and hunger.

Title II has also been used to support economic development projects as partial payment of wages and for school lunch programs. The Community Development Foundation and other U.S. private, voluntary agencies as well as U.S. aid

technicians have demonstrated that food can be used to finance scores of urgently needed community and rural development projects around the world. Much of the cost of these projects can be financed by paying the workers in food. In this fashion, food not only fills empty stomach, it creates employment, preserves human dignity, and creates capital improvements.

In the Dominican Republic, for example, the Community Development Foundation estimates that underemployment wastes 160 million man-days annually. Yet, the country has a desperate need for water projects, schools, and roads that could be built with idle laborers who could be paid in food. Southeast Asia, including North and South Vietnam, also provides a similar challenge.

A new development which shows promise is the use of food to finance youth work camps to combat juvenile delinquency and idleness. Food is also used to grubstake farm families for opening new areas to cultivation. This growing trend away from straight food donations, as in a welfare program, to the use of food in payment for constructive work is an important one. In this way, food for peace can serve a double duty of combating malnutrition and directly promoting economic development.

The third title of Public Law 480 authorizes private, voluntary agencies to distribute surplus food overseas. We are all familiar with the fine work done by organizations such as CARE and a score of church-connected agencies including Church World Service, Catholic Relief Services, Lutheran World Relief, the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, the Quakers, and the Mennonites. Seventy million people in 112 countries and territories are receiving supplemental food under this title. Since 1954, $2.5 billion worth of flour, cornmeal, powdered milk, rice, cheese, and edible oils have been distributed by private agencies. Their good works are known across the world from Calcutta to Lima, from Hong Kong to Algiers. They distribute 3 billion pounds of food yearly.

Included among the recipients of food for peace through the voluntary agencies are 55 million children—some 32 million in school lunch programs. The brightest chapter in the voluntary program and indeed in the entire food-for-peace effort is the international school lunch program. Three-quarters of the children in these programs receive their lunches through one or another of the voluntary associations who work in the food-for-peace program. Usually the lunch is not fancy—a roll and a glass of reconstituted, nonfat milk.

Nevertheless, for most of the recipients, this is the only nourishing meal of the day. Sometimes, it is supplemented by vegetables, fruits, or meat added by local parents or school officials. The schoolchildren's gardens in Dominica provide supplemental food there. The results have been nothing less than spectacular in terms of better health and sharply improved academic growth.

Under title IV in the food-for-peace law, put into use in 1961, we have sold on long-term loans about $150 million of foodstuffs.

Mr. President, I could speak at great length about the achievements of the program carried on under Public Law 480—the food-for-peace program. I was fortunate to be called upon by the late President Kennedy to serve as director of food for peace during 1961 and 1962. President Kennedy recognized the tremendous importance of our food surpluses in a world where half the population does not have enough to eat. On January 24, 1961, as one of the first acts of his administration, he issued an Executive order creating the office of food for peace. In a memorandum to the heads of Government departments and agencies the late President stated:

> American agricultural abundance offers a great opportunity for the United States to promote the interests of peace in a significant way and to play an important role in helping to provide a more adequate diet for peoples all around the world. We must make the most vigorous and constructive use possible of this opportunity. We must narrow the gap between abundance here at home and near starvation abroad. Humanity, and prudence alike, counsel a major effort on our part.

President Eisenhower had previously urged greater use of our food abundance abroad and the program has been given strong approval by President Johnson.

The overall accomplishments of the food-for-peace program since 1954 have indeed been extremely important. This massive American effort to outlaw hunger has no parallel in human history. One hundred million people throughout the world today benefit directly from the American food-for-peace effort. Many, many more benefit indirectly. Moreover, the food-for-peace program has had its impact in the United States, too.

One hundred and twenty million tons of food, valued at $13 billion—enough to fill three large ships each day for 10 years—have been sent overseas from American farms under the terms of Public Law 480. This represents 27 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports. In certain commodities, such as wheat, two-thirds of our exports have been under food-for-peace auspices. One out of three acres of American wheat is now utilized in food for peace.

Aside from the much larger income it has made possible for American farmers, food-for-peace sales have resulted in substantial income to our economy as a whole, including suppliers of farm machinery, seeds, fertilizer, and insecticides. It has meant an additional 1.4 billion to the American shipping industry. Currencies generated by the sales now save us nearly $300 million annually in foreign exchange, which helps our balance-of-payments situation. Furthermore, a sizable portion of the local currencies which we have loaned to foreign governments will be repaid.

Food for peace has contributed to the national interest by developing new commercial marketing opportunities for American products. A substantial part of the proceeds of foreign currency sales have been used to advertise and promote American farm products. Private commercial organizations have cooperated with the Federal Government in trade fairs and other promotion activities overseas. Through food for peace we have introduced our commodities to countries which become commercial purchasers. Japan, Italy, and Spain, among others, were among the first recipients of the food-for-peace program and have already moved into the position of strong dollar customers.

CLOSING THE WORLD FOOD GAP

The food-for-peace program has been a wonderful effort, with average exports of $1.8 billion a year. It has made a very sizable contribution to the total task of achieving freedom from want.

We have learned through experience with it how to make increasingly efficient and effective use of our foods. We are ready, in my judgment, to move on into another history-making phase and undertake the whole job.

In my recent book, "War Against Want," I estimated the cost of eliminating hunger in the world, with the exception of Red China, at $4 billion a year in addition to present outlays. Including Red China, it would be approximately $5½ billion.

A recent study by the Agriculture Department confirms these figures and projects a food gap in the free world at about $2.5 billion worth of foodstuffs at the end of this decade. That allows for present U.S. food-for-peace efforts. The study, entitled "The World Food Budget, 1970," considers only the value of foodstuffs. When costs of processing, shipping, and distributing surplus food in the world are added, a total between $3 and $4 billion a year would close the food gap in the free world.

ECONOMIC EFFECT IN THE UNITED STATES OF THE WAR AGAINST WANT

What would it mean in the United States to try to close this gap? Roughly, agricultural economists estimate that American farmers would have to produce one-third more wheat, increase milk output by 50 percent, raise 25 percent more soybeans, and step up production of vegetable oils by a third. American farmers could fill this order by putting land and resources now idle into productive use again. Only about 75 percent of our agricultural capacity is being used today. This compares with steel production at about 85 percent of capacity, and overall industrial output at 87 percent of capacity, as measured by the Federal Reserve Board.

American farmers could benefit greatly from a program to meet food needs and it would add substantially to the Nation's economic strength. Heavy storage charges on surpluses could virtually be eliminated. The money such a program would put into the hands of American farmers would be plowed back almost immediately into business and consumer spending. Farmers would need as much as a million additional tons of fertilizer, and more machinery, equipment, gasoline, oil, and other supplies. Employment on farms and in factories would increase. A national publication, U.S. News & World Report, has estimated that "if present food-for-peace shipments were doubled, close to 30 million tons of shipping would be required each year.

That would fill 1,000 so-called supercarrier ships averaging 30,000 tons of cargo apiece."

There will be objections raised to this bill. The first will undoubtedly be the expense. My bill would ultimately more than double existing expenditures for food supplies sent overseas. In order to be effective, it would have to be done on the basis of a long-term commitment, not simply an annual appropriation. It is my contention, however, that such a program would not actually be costly. We would not be surrendering any of our capital assets—only making greater use of them.

A recent study of the dynamic forces in agriculture was prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Dr. Walter Wilcox, author of the report, found that potential farm production in the absence of acreage diversion programs is increasing three times as fast today as 30 years ago, with most of the increase occurring in crop production per acre. Traction power has increased 40 percent in the past 10 years. Expenditures for farm pesticides have increased two to three times in the past 10 years. Fertilizer use has almost doubled and nitrogen use has more than doubled. As a result, we confront increased acreage yields. It is economic for farmers to buy and use fertilizers which will increase corn yields one-third or more. Wheat and cotton yields will increase greatly in the decade ahead. We are also producing more livestock products per hundred pounds of feed than in previous years. Dairymen get more milk per cow. We produce chickens with a declining amount of feed and chickens produce more eggs for the same weight of feed. The evidence presented in the Wilcox report indicates that productivity gains ahead are so great that we will have to have tighter and tighter acreage controls—more diversions and more farm program expense.

To undertake a program of the scope I have described, Mr. President, will provide an outlet for the tremendous increase in agricultural productivity which we can expect over the next decade, as well as providing an incentive for the use of productive land not in use at all today.

To deal with these anticipated surpluses in any other manner than the one I am imposing would be equally expensive—perhaps even more expensive in terms of public outlays, displacement of farm families, and unemployment and relief—without the worldwide benefits.

On the other hand, if Federal programs are not adjusted, the sharp decline in farm income would cost our farm States, our farm manufacturers, and, indeed, the entire Nation millions and millions of dollars in reduced tax revenues and increased welfare programs. Economist Leon Keyserling estimates that half of our present urban unemployment can be traced to the decline of rural job opportunities and farmer purchasing power. In the long run, through the multiplied effect of a prosperous agricultural economy, the program I propose would bring more money to the farmers and to all those who depend upon agriculture directly or indirectly, and a greater return to the Federal Government.

What we must acknowledge, Mr. President, is that properly used American agricultural productivity is not a liability to the United States, but an asset. As Vice President HUMPHREY has said, in discussing the impact of our food program:

> In a real sense what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world. It is not a laggard; it is not a burden; it is not what is holding America back. It is what is putting America ahead.
>
> The food-for-peace program is a 20th-century form of alchemy. Food for peace has provided the means for converting America's agricultural productivity and abundance into schools and textbooks, hospitals, bridges, and roads—the vital ingredients of economic and social growth in the developing nations of the world. This ingenuity of using food as a resource for development has been termed one of the most imaginative instruments ever created for the purposes of sharing agricultural abundance with undernourished people and emerging nations.
>
> But this progress, as good as it is, only begins to meet the needs of the American people. There is much that remains to be done. We will do it.

POLITICAL ASPECTS OF THE WAR AGAINST WANT

There are those who will object to an all-out war against want on political grounds. It will be argued that our food should go only to friendly, capitalistic, democratic countries. Admittedly, it is infuriating when a dictator who has accepted American aid for years tells us to "take your aid and go drink from the sea." We must remember, however, that the people, and particularly the children, receiving our food should not be punished for the sins of their governments. They have very little to say about those governments at present. Children as well as underprivileged adults will suffer enough from bad local government without our punishing them for political reasons.

Food for peace has served important foreign policy objectives of the United States under what may originally have appeared as unfavorable conditions. For example, in 1957 President Eisenhower authorized American food are to Poland and Yugoslavia. Since then, Poland has received $671 million in food and Yugoslavia $906 million. An important result has been to encourage these two quasi-Communist States to maintain a growing degree of independence.

Furthermore, both countries have discarded Communist techniques of trying to grow farm products in government collective farms. They have moved back to private family farming which is apparently far more successful than the Soviet Government's collective. In these particular cases our negotiations and contracts were with Communist governments, but the impact of our surpluses has been helping the two nations to show not only their people but also the Soviets that independent family farming, with a profit incentive, is superior to collectivism. Our agricultural surpluses distributed behind the Iron Curtain are the best possible argument for a free enterprise system. They are also proof to the common people of these lands that the United States is aware of and concerned over their needs.

Also, Mr. President, we should consider what overall effect it might have if a great many nations of the world, including some who are now enemies, were dependent upon the United States for a substantial portion of their food supplies. Would this dependence not discourage them from military action or indeed from creating any kind of violence in which needed food might be endangered? Insofar as trade creates interdependence, it should, over the long run, contribute to a more peaceful world in which all countries recognize the benefits derived from commercial relationships with others.

THE MORAL ISSUE INVOLVED

Finally, Mr. President, we must not be blind to the moral issue involved in world hunger. The great religions of the world have all recognized this factor. "Cast thy bread upon the waters: for thou shalt find it after many days" admonished the Hebrew writer of Ecclesiastes.

"If thine enemy hunger, feed him," wrote St. Paul in his letter to the Romans.

In the words of the Koran:

> An abominable sin is to sleep on a full stomach while your neighbor is sleeping on an empty stomach.

Around the globe, I have looked into the eyes of children suffering the debilitating effects of prolonged malnutrition. Their distended stomachs and gaunt limbs offer little hope of a life of comfort or productive work. In Africa there is a particularly prevalent disease known as Kwashiorkor. Literally translated from Swahili, this means the illness which the older child gets after the next child is born. It is basically a protein deficiency caused when an older child is no longer nursed and must replace his mother's milk with a protein deficient diet. These are children who can be helped and we have it in our power to help them. I believe it is a moral as well as economic imperative that we make our abundance available where the need is so great.

The people of the United States have always responded to the cry for food in famine or other national disasters. Chronic hunger may not appear as dramatic or urgent as a sudden earthquake or flood, but its long-term effect upon the peoples of underdeveloped continents are far worse.

The time has come for the people of the United States to recognize the role that we can and should play in the war against want. We can help our own farmers by permitting them to produce to their full potential. We can help the manufacturers and merchants who depend upon agriculture for their livelihood. We can help the people of our own country by reducing the funds necessary for restrictive farm programs and for continued storage of our vast surpluses.

By most important, Mr. President, we can help the hungry people throughout the world who have literally nowhere

else to turn if we do not share our bounty and our skills with them. The program I have outlined is a practical and realistic approach to one of the greatest problems facing the world today. I strongly urge my colleagues to give it their careful consideration.

Mr. President, one of the finest statements I have seen on the challenge of world hunger is a resolution adopted by the general board of the National Council of Churches on June 3, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that this superb statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the article and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2157) to provide for U.S. participation and leadership in an international effort to end malnutrition and human want, and for related purposes, introduced by Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself and Mr. NELSON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The article and statement presented by Mr. MCGOVERN are as follows:

1963 shows United States leads world in net flow of aid capital to needy nations

Country	Bilateral assistance through—		Contribution to international agencies through—		Total aid
	Public sources	Private sources	Public sources	Private sources	
United States	$3,540,000,000	$813,000,000	$181,000,000	$5,000,000	$4,539,000,000
France	834,000,000	314,000,000	29,000,000	1,000,000	1,178,000,000
United Kingdom	370,000,000	379,000,000	45,000,000	1,000,000	795,000,000
West Germany	399,000,000	153,000,000	25,000,000	11,000,000	588,000,000
Japan	161,000,000	95,000,000	12,000,000		268,000,000
Sino-Soviet bloc	465,000,000		6,000,000		471,000,000
Other [1]	359,000,000	715,000,000	93,000,000	[2]—49,000,000	1,118,000,000
Total	6,128,000,000	2,469,000,000	391,000,000	[2]—31,000,000	8,957,000,000

[1] Includes the 10 OECD countries not listed above.
[2] Repayment of securities by international agencies exceeded private purchases.

FOREIGN AID: WHO GIVES WHAT?

(NOTE.—Sixteen nations have continuing programs to aid economic development in Latin America, Africa, and Asia. A new ERS study assesses the U.S. effort in relation to that of France, the United Kingdom, and other major donors.)

BONN, October 28, 1964.—For the first time, West Germany has granted a long-term foreign-aid loan at only 1-percent interest. Recipient is Rwanda in east central Africa.

PARIS, January 7, 1965.—France today signed a new agreement to aid agricultural development in Senegal, a former French colony.

MOSCOW, February 19, 1965.—The Soviet Union will help Tunisia build a national technical institute to train engineers and other badly needed specialists.

Such news items out of Europe tend to highlight the fact that the United States isn't the only Nation helping the less fortunate.

Sixteen countries, all highly industrialized, have economic-aid programs to assist the less developed regions of the world. Among them, in addition to the United States, are the United Kingdom, France, West Germany, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

Where does the United States stand in comparison with the 15 other major contributors?

A new ERS study shows that we provide over half the total net flow of public aid and private capital going into the less developed world under the bilateral (direct country-to-country) assistance programs of all 16 nations. In 1963 we contributed almost $4.4 billion of the $8.6 billion total. (See table above; 1963 last available figures.)

Some of the 16 also contribute to the aid programs of several U.N. technical and financial agencies and such regional groups as the European Development Fund.

The ERS study shows that, as in the case of bilateral aid, the United States supplies about half of the funds going into the aid programs of the international agencies. Our share in 1963 came to $186 million of the $360 million total contributed.

The above totals include funds channeled through public (that is, government sponsored) aid programs, plus capital investments and technical assistance from private industry.

Using the public-private breakdown, the study shows that the United States in 1963 supplied 58 percent of all public aid and 33 percent of all private capital under the bilateral programs of the 16 donor countries. In round figures, this means we put up $3.5 billion of the $6.1 billion total in public aid funds; $800 million of the $2.5 billion invested by private industry.

France is the second largest donor; in 1963 it furnished 13 percent of the total capital flow, public and private, into the less developed world. Some 94 percent of this aid went to former French territories in Africa. Recently, however, France has stepped up its aid to African nations that aren't former territories as well as to Greece, India, Pakistan, Mexico, and Turkey.

The United Kingdom is the third largest donor, supplying in 1963 about 9 percent of total world aid. With a policy similar to the French, British aid goes chiefly to such Commonwealth countries as India and Pakistan. But London too, has recently expanded its program to include such non-Commonwealth nations as Chile, Algeria, Syria, South Vietnam, and Korea.

Fourth largest donor is West Germany. Although most of its aid is in deutsche mark loans rather than in grants or soft currency repayments, the government reduced its aid budget in 1964. This was an effort to shift more of the aid burden to the country's prospering private sector. Almost half of West Germany's public aid in 1964 was earmarked for Asian countries, about 17 percent for such African nations as Liberia and the United Arab Republic (Egypt), another 10 percent for European and Latin American countries.

Still far below the aid levels of the United States, France, and others, the Sino-Soviet bloc had more than doubled its 1961 aid level of $200 million to $465 million by 1963. The United Arab Republic gets the lion's share, followed by India, Afghanistan, and Indonesia.

If this then, is the world's economic aid picture, where does food aid fit in?

As in other categories, the United States is far and away the major contributor of food assistance.

Among other industrial nations, only Canada, Australia, France, and West Germany have shipped sizable amounts of food, either for emergency use or development needs. In the 1952–63 period, these four nations shipped a total of $251 million in food and fiber, with Canada supplying 89 percent. During the same period U.S. food and fiber aid came to $9.9 billion or 97.5 percent of the world total.

Total U.S. food and fiber aid shipments since World War II: $25.7 billion.

The figures are for 1946 through fiscal 1964. They include shipments under our own programs and those of international agencies.

In the early postwar years, of course, U.S. food aid was used primarily to help war-shattered nations get back on their feet.

With the passage of Public Law 480 in 1954 the emphasis shifted to using food as a device to help emerging countries develop and diversify their economies. Prior to 1962 sizable quantities of food were also sent under the Mutual Security Act of 1954.

During fiscal years 1955–64, we shipped a total of $14.3 billion in foodstuffs to needy countries under concessional terms. These terms varied, but most shipments were made under Public Law 480's title I whereby the recipient country paid in its own currency. Some of this currency was used to pay U.S. costs incurred in the country, but much was returned to the country as grants or as loans to help finance its economic development program.

Over the 1955–64 period, this $14.3 billion in food and fiber aid represented about one-third of our total farm exports, the rest being dollar sales. Similarly, farm commodity aid over the 1952–63 period made up about one-third of all U.S. economic assistance to other countries.

From 1957 high, aid shipments as share of U.S. farm exports have declined

[In millions]

Year	Government programs		Commercial exports	Total exports	Government exports as a percent of total exports
	Total Public Law 480	Mutual security			
1955	416	450	2,278	3,144	27
1956	1,012	355	2,129	3,496	39
1957	1,563	394	2,771	4,728	41
1958	1,024	227	2,752	4,003	31
1959	1,044	210	2,465	3,719	33
1960	1,143	167	3,207	4,517	29
1961	1,386	186	3,374	4,946	32
1962	1,586	74	3,482	5,142	32
1963	1,529	13	3,536	5,078	30
1964	1,539	23	4,512	6,074	26
1955–64	12,242	2,099	30,506	44,847	32

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

(Resolution on world hunger, adopted by the general board on June 3, 1965)

I. THE BROAD CONTEXT OF ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

1. We see a tremendous urgency in matters of hunger and food, in relation to our Christian faith, to our concern with human values, to prospects for the world's food demand and supply during the next several years, and to basic economic and social development. Food is and will continue to be a key issue, and even more so if the United States continues a policy of relatively decreasing production in agriculture. Unless the United States, with its outstanding capacities and world responsibilities, develops new concepts of larger production for programs related to world needs, the predicted widespread, acute famine in some areas of the world in the next few years will become more grim. Even more important is U.S. cooperation in helping other nations to develop their own food production and supplies. Both in the sharing of food and in concerted efforts to improve food production, it is imperative that the United States work closely with other countries in building up the already existing international programs and agencies. We must address ourselves as churches and as a nation to these and to larger related concepts and programs, even as we take first steps such as embodied in the resolution on world hunger.

2. While specialized emphases can be useful in the various sectors of development, the largest need, in our judgment, is better integration of the interrelated sectors in an overall strategy of development, particularly in view of the new international focus through the United Nations on trade and development.

3. Manifold human needs confront the whole human family. These needs can be met basically and soundly only through fundamental world economic and social development. Such development comprises a highly complex set of interrelated factors involving all dimensions of life such as the economic, social, political, demographic, cultural, even the military, and most profoundly the moral and spiritual. This process must also be internationally conceived with all nations willing to participate taking upon themselves both corporately and individually the fullest possible cooperative initiative and responsibility. Further, these problems are so vast that no limited campaign or crusade can be expected to resolve them, although such efforts can call attention to some issues and to the fact that they demand basic, long-term, substantial commitment for the foreseeable future. Some of the more optimistic leaders in this field predict that, if we substantially increase what is now being done in economic and social development, and deal adequately with vast population problems, we may possibly look forward to a world relatively free from hunger, poverty, illiteracy and obviously conquerable diseases by the end of the 20th century. But such a goal will demand considerably more commitment by all the nations of the world than is presently even in prospect, both in time concept and in magnitude.

4. All the above considerations urgently demand a strategy of world economic and social development. From the past 20 years of experience it is becoming clear that the vast complex of interrelated international realities demand a concerted, strategic approach by the international community and by each nation in cooperation. The World Council of Churches through its commission of the churches on international affairs has called for such strategic thinking and has set forth some major elements of it. We feel that the time has come for the National Council of Churches to devote study in depth and in breadth to further strategic thinking in this vast field of world economic and social development. We further hold that such undertaking must be done in fullest possible cooperation with the responsible leadership of other religious groups. We have begun this process. Meanwhile, as one of the first steps, we adopt a resolution for education and action on world hunger.

II. THE SITUATION WITH RESPECT TO WORLD HUNGER

1. Two billion persons, two-thirds of the world's population) live in areas of nutritional deficiency. An estimated half of these, 1 billion human beings, suffer daily or recurrent crippling hunger. The explosive population growth, in contrast with generally slow increases in agricultural production, points toward more widespread human suffering from hunger in the years ahead. Other unfavorable factors are the prejudice of cultural patterns, the pressures of trade and finance, political instability in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, natural disasters, and the sheer complexity of concerted international action on a problem where no nation acting singly can find a solution. Time is running out.

2. Initial but limited steps are underway to meet the problem. The United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization has been sponsoring a freedom from hunger campaign to awaken the conscience of mankind. It publishes world food survey and has started a small experimental world food program. A first World Food Congress has been held and a second planned for 1967 or 1968. The U.N. Population Commission reports the explosive population pressures and prospects which show the desperate need for international and cooperative national programs of assistance on population problems.

3. In this country the U.S. Government has made substantial contributions in recent years toward the world food supply through various mutual aid measures, sales for national currencies, and donations to the needy. In addition, the U.S. Government through its foreign aid program has been spending considerable sums in rural and agricultural technical assistance; and it has supported modestly the various related U.N. programs. The United States still confronts the problem, however, of shifting the emphasis in domestic agricultural policy from restriction of acreage and production and from surplus disposal toward full utilization of agricultural productive capacity for world food needs. In the business sector production of fertilizers, seeds, and farm machinery has been expanding along with steady growth in the food processing and service industry.

4. The churches and voluntary agencies (the World Council of Churches, the Roman Catholic Church, the National Council of Churches of Christ in the USA, the members of the American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, and many other groups) have been expressing their mounting concern for the hungry and conducting sizable relief and related self-help programs.

5. All these steps, however—intergovernmental, governmental, business, and voluntary agency—are fragmented and inadequate. Great though the advance has been in technical skills and productive capacity, the growth in population and in need races ahead. This tragic paradox is the heart of the problem, for, despite all that is being done, it seems that our very ability to conserve and enlarge life itself only causes more misery in the end. The situation is threatening to get out of hand. On this our gaze is fixed; and to this the attention of the nations of the world and their determined will must be turned.

6. People now dimly realize that, for the first time in history, the capabilities and techniques exist to prevent the warping of lives and the deaths caused by hunger. The freedom from hunger campaign started a framework which, if expanded and developed, would enable the whole world to join in turning the tide. Only a coordinated program, recognizing the interrelationships of aid and trade and development and attacking the causes of hunger and enlisting the knowledge, will and resources of every nation and of all the relevant agencies of government, commerce, industry, the universities, the press, the churches—indeed every major human activity—will suffice. We do not pretend to suggest that U.S. resources alone can meet more than a fraction of the need. Nevertheless, thankfully recognizing all that has been done, it is our conviction as Christians and citizens of the United States that responsibility now lies on the people of this country to take every step we can, in partnership with all others who will join, to mount a massive, unified attack on this enemy of human decency, of life itself. The universal human conscience will not permit us to be silent nor fail to offer every skill and strength we have. Here lies the opportunity for humanitarian statesmanship, so to join forces as to reverse this drift toward disaster and do together what none can do separately. Men and women everywhere in all their varied pursuits, oppressed by the bleak prospects of the cold war, should embrace with relief and joy the affirmative purpose of moving toward the elimination of hunger from the world in a new cooperative enterprise.

7. For Christians the issue is clear and final. For us the issue is sharpened by the fact that for the most part the world's resources lie in areas where Christians predominate, and the world's needs in areas where Christians are fewest. For Christians the holy gifts of knowledge and scientific skill and the needs of our neighbors lay a mandate on our conscience to which only one answer is possible. Yet we know that we are not alone either in pity or in anger at this misery. The time has fully come when the peoples and governments of the world must, together, take sides for man against the pain and death caused by our failure to use our knowledge aright, and to order our affairs so that human needs and resources can go hand in hand.

8. From a material point of view, the role of the churches is small by comparison with the size of commercial and governmental activities in food and agriculture. In fact, the weight of decision clearly lies with Government. Initiative by governments is essential in the marshaling of cooperative action.

III. THE RESOLUTION

1. The National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A. therefore calls on the U.S. Government, acting through the President and the Congress, to take the initiative promptly in cooperation with other governments and international agencies for international action which will move toward making freedom from hunger a reality, along the lines of the following proposals:

(a) Declare as a matter of high policy that the United States is prepared to make the elimination of world hunger a major objective of our Nation working with other governments and intends to work with other governments and organizations to this end. Include as the principal components of this policy (1) that peoples everywhere should be urged to produce abundantly the basic staples of life, with appropriate regard for nutritional needs; (2) that such staples should be accessible to all without regard to race, color, creed, or politics, or to cold war considerations; (3) that family planning must be emphasized as of equal importance with food production; (4) that the dominant

framework of action should be international and/or regional, since no single nation can be truly self-sufficient; (5) that special additional measures must be taken to meet the food needs of the hungry until such time as world agricultural production is greatly increased and the balance is in sight between population growth and food supply; and (6) that along with expansion of agricultural production, industrial and economic growth must take place if the world is to be fed.

(b) Seek, in concert with other nations, to have a comprehensive and effective international undertaking to determine, on a country-by-country and regional basis, what can and should be done to meet world food needs both for the short run and the long run. This undertaking might focus upon a specially designed international conference of governmental and nongovernmental representatives and it should, in any case, include the fullest possible use of FAO, its responsible bodies, the continuing freedom from hunger campaign, and the next World Food Congress. Qualified representatives from all sectors of human activity with interests in food, agriculture, fisheries, and population problems should be included: public and private; business and voluntary agency; production, processing, transportation, industry, commerce; education; finance; and the mass media.

(c) Shift the present emphasis in U.S. domestic farm policy from one of restriction and surplus disposal, to one of utilization of agriculture productive capacity, increasingly directed toward world nutritional needs.

(d) In recognition of the necessity of family planning as an integral part of the present paradoxical situation, increase support of governmental and private programs in this field, utilizing new means that now exist, which from the point of view of technology and cost, may provide the opportunity of checking the population growth.

(e) Expand international programs in agricultural production, extension services, food processing and distribution, as well as in general education. There is need to expand training facilities at home and abroad, and to adapt more of our courses in higher institutions to the needs abroad, not only for the training of the experts, but for young people of the United States interested in service abroad, both in governmental programs like the Peace Corps, and also under nongovernmental auspices including religious agencies.

(f) Strengthen U.S. support of the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization, the U.N. Population Commission and other related international agencies in fulfillment of the objectives of the currently proclaimed International Cooperation Year, the World Food Congress of 1963, and other related efforts. Support in a much more substantial and significant way the renewed campaign for freedom from hunger being carried out through FAO through 1970. The world food program, started in 1963 for a 3-year trial, should be continued and expanded very greatly if it is to make a major contribution toward meeting world hunger needs. We urge that UNFAO develop further its role as a central clearinghouse of information as to world nutritional needs and plans and progress toward meeting them.

(g) Revise basic legislation, including Public Law 480, to authorize the provision of more food of more varied character for an adequate diet for those who do not have enough now, to stimulate agricultural production, including the conservation and development of fisheries, everywhere for the longer run and to relate these objectives to the broad considerations of economic development and trade policy. Provisions should be made to enable trained personnel in Government service to serve abroad under national and international auspices for prolonged periods of time, without losing their seniority pension rights or other benefits.

(h) As the first step toward U.S. participation in such integrated action on a world scale, convoke a preliminary consultation in Washington, also of governmental and nongovernmental representatives from as many related fields as possible, to prepare for consideration at the international conference, outlines of requirements and resources, with particular reference to U.S. capabilities, U.S. agricultural policy in relation to world needs, and consideration of Public Law 480.

(i) Should international agreement lag unduly, proceed with whatever action may be feasible on these matters, in the conviction that the needs of the hungry are so urgent as not to permit delay, and that others will come to a similar conviction as the situation deteriorates.

2. With respect to the churches, the council:

(a) Authorizes its president, in company with other council and church leaders, to present these proposals to the President and the Congress.

(b) Calls upon its member churches and their full constituency, lay and clerical, to support these proposals by letters to the President and the Congress, and by other means, and to review their overseas activities to the end of increasing, to the greatest extent practicable, efforts to help meet world hunger.

(c) Urges the members of the churches to volunteer and give of themselves in preparation and service for the manifold tasks involved in eliminating hunger with a sense of Christian commitment in fulfilling one of the moral obligations laid upon the Christian community today.

(d) Requests the World Council of Churches similarly to call upon its member churches to urge their governments to participate in this initiative, and to take all practicable actions in their own church programs to share in the enterprise.

(e) Urges the Division of Overseas Ministries to press on with its analysis of U.S. church programs abroad with the view of making recommendations as to how the churches may, more effectively and more ecumenically, play their proper role in meeting the needs of the hungry.

(f) Authorizes the Division of Overseas Ministries to enter into consultation and negotiation with representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, for the purpose of more effective and ecumenical Christian relief, welfare, and service activities throughout the world, including joint operations where appropriate. In this connection, close coordination should be maintained with the World Council of Churches in its current discussions with representatives of the Vatican on these and related matters. Appropriate coordination with churches not members of the National Council and with Jewish and other voluntary agencies, is also encouraged.

Appendix I

Relevant NCCCUSA Policy Background

1. General board action of June 4, 1958, "Ethical Goals for Agricultural Policy."

2. General assembly action of December 9, 1960, "Ethical Issues in the International Age of Agriculture."

3. World Council of Churches Central Committee action in 1960 to support the Freedom From Hunger campaign.

4. General Board action of February 23, 1961, "Responsible Parenthood."

5. Action of the general board, Des Moines, December 3, 1964:

"That the general board request the division of overseas ministries in cooperation with other units of the council to study the problem of hunger with the intent of bringing to the National Council of Churches at an early date a report with recommendations as to how the churches in cooperation with government and other agencies may more adequately and ecumenically participate in the critical task of meeting the needs of the hungry people of the world."

6. Action of the DOM Program Board, February 12, 1965:

"The program board, having received the request of the general board in December concerning a report on world hunger and Christian responsibility, and a preliminary report and accompanying proposals from the staff, asks that these now be redrafted in the light of discussion, that an interim report be made to the general board in Portland, and authorized the executive committee of the program board to prepare a report and recommendations for the general board for action in June."

7. Action of the general board, February 25, 1965:

"That the board receive the progress report of the DOM (on world hunger) and that the general board express its urgent request that the subject of 'The Churches and World Hunger' be presented again to the June 1965 meeting of the board with proposals for specific action by the board at that time, with the understanding that present policy of the council authorizes appropriate action to be taken by the division of overseas ministries and other units of the council in the intervening period."

8. Action of the DOM Executive Committee, March 12, 1965:

"That the executive committee approves in principle the resolution on 'world hunger' and requests all members to make comments with regard to it, to be put into the hands of Mr. Farley. Staff is authorized to make a second draft, to be reviewed by a small committee, and the final draft then to be sent to the general board for its June meeting."

Appendix II

A Selected Bibliography on World Hunger

1. James Norris statement in Vatican Council II.

2. Declaration of the World Food Congress, 1963.

3. Address by Mr. B. R. Sen, director general of the FAO, to the plenary session of the 38th International Eucharistic Congress, Bombay, India, December 1964, and to the U.N. Population Commission, New York, March 24, 1965.

4. Edward Rogers, "Poverty on a Small Planet," the MacMillan Co., N.Y., 1965.

5. "Are We Our Brother's Keeper," by Barbara Ward in "Christanity and Crisis," p. 3, vol. xxv. No. 1, February 8, 1965.

6. The Visser't Hooft statement before the WCC Central Committee at Enugu, Nigeria, January 1965:

"In our times the basic problem of overcoming hunger or poverty and of social justice has become the issue which dominates all other issues and on the solution of which the future of mankind depends."

7. The "Commonweal," November 13, 1964, issue, on "World Poverty and the Christian."

8. The Friends Committee for National Legislation "Washington Newsletter", November 1964.

9. Vatican Council II, "De Ecclesia."

10. "Closing the Hunger Gap," page 6, The New Republic, January 30, 1965.

11. Jonathan Garst, "No Need for Hunger."

12. Ira Moomaw, "To Hunger No More," New York, Friendship Press, 1963.

13. Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, "War Against Want," New York, Walker, 1964.

14. Paul and William Paddock, "Hungry Nations," 1964.

15. Walter Lippmann, "The Great Revolution," lecture at U.N. for International Cooperation Year, March 1, 1965.

SPECIAL INDEMNITY INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES SERVING IN COMBAT ZONES

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am introducing a bill which will provide insurance protection without cost to members of the Armed Forces serving in a combat zone outside the United States, the geographical limitations of such area being prescribed by Presidential proclamation.

In order that there will be no delay in granting insurance benefits to U.S. forces in combat zones, section H of this bill I am introducing will give to the President the authority to determine those combat zones in which units of the U.S. Armed Forces are engaged.

I am introducing this bill specifically to provide protection to the dependents of members of our Armed Forces engaged in operations in Vietnam, in southeast Asia, and in the Dominican Republic. These men, and some women, are engaged in fighting, defending against aggression, which the Congress of the United States, has by resolutions declared necessary to our national security. Relatively few in number compared to our population or to the total number of men in their age category, they are bearing the burden for all. We owe to them at least the assurance of some protection to their dependents, an assurance provided to those who fought in other wars.

I hope that the committee will act upon the bill and that it will be speedily enacted by the Congress.

I ask that the bill lie on the desk until Wednesday, June 23, for additional sponsors.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Kentucky.

The bill (S. 2158) to amend title 38, United States Code, in order to provide special indemnity insurance for members of the Armed Forces serving in combat zones, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 281

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to H.R. 6453 providing appropriations for the District of Columbia. The amendment would restore to the budget of the District of Columbia funds to provide aid to the dependent children of unemployed parents.

The problems faced by the needy families who would be assisted by this legislation have nowhere been better expressed than in the article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Nightmarish Scramble for Food, Shelter, Described by Needy Families." I ask unanimous consent that the article be entered in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and lie on the table; and, without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article presented by Mr. RIBICOFF is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1965]

NIGHTMARISH SCRAMBLE DESCRIBED BY NEEDY

(By Dorothy Gilliam)

Needy families ineligible for Washington welfare aid because an unemployed parent is in the home, describe their lives as a nightmarish scramble for food, shelter and money.

Some wives tell how they escape by encouraging their husbands to desert the family, thus making sure the children will have bread and a roof.

Others tell why they prefer to remain in the vise together although it often means getting "set out" (evicted) or "putting the children away" (sending them to Junior Village).

The Welfare Department estimated that families involving 5,200 people would qualify next year if Washington took part in the Federal program of welfare aid to children of jobless parents.

Under current District relief rules, children are ineligible for assistance if there is an able-bodied man living in either a husband or father relationship, whether or not he has a job.

The push to include the controversial program has been sparked for several years by groups such as the citizens' committee on the public welfare crisis, and more recently by the coalition of conscience.

The Senate District Appropriations Subcommittee voted Monday to include the bill, but the full Appropriations Committee yesterday defeated it by a 16-to-12 vote, a victory for Subcommittee Chairman, ROBERT C. BYRD, Democrat, of West Virginia, avowed foe of the bill.

He maintains that the District unemployment rate is too low to justify the program, among other objections. Its fate is now up to the Senate.

Meanwhile yesterday, the Senate District Committee approved legislation providing help to families if the head of the household is actively seeking a job or is in a job training program, a bill introduced by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut.

A 21-year-old mother of three who lives in central Northwest told how her husband, 29, can work at his trade as a cement finisher only during good weather and how they must depend on gratuities of private social agencies during winter.

"One winter we had to separate so we could get some help," she said. "You know that was bad, but he couldn't find no work, and we had to do something."

"When he works he takes good care of us, and we get along real well," she said.

"It upsets him when he can't take care of us," she continued, stopping to quiet her 3-year-old son. "He mopes around and says if he would do such and such in the summer things would be better."

When he works, her husband brings home about $90 a week. Rent is $90 a month. They have tried to save during the spring and summer, she said. But there were major illnesses, including a $500 bill for her 2-year-old daughter (who is anemic), and she is expecting her fourth child next month.

A 34-year-old Southwest mother of 10 whose husband works sporadically because he is ill, related her difficulty in getting help when he was seriously sick at home recently.

"Welfare gave me three checks when he was in the hospital last year," she said. "But since he's been sick at home they said they couldn't help me. I also couldn't get surplus food.

"Right now I'm worried sick, because we're 'way behind in the rent (they live in a public housing project) they told me they were going to set us out."

The man, 41, who suffers from a severe stomach ailment, can work only sporadically at his job as a porter, where he earns $82.50 a week, before deductions.

"We've borrowed so much from the credit union where he works just to keep up the rent and eat he never brings home more than $60 or so," she said.

"Right now we're living mainly on beans and cabbage. I can't buy no meat."

A 22-year-old mother of five children under 4 told how her then jobless 24-year-old husband was jailed several months ago for housebreaking. "He couldn't get a job so he stole things and sold them and gave us money so we could eat. I knew it was wrong but I was tired of seeing my children suffer."

"He was in and out of work until both of us just got to the breaking point. Finally he up and left and I applied for public assistance."

Later, he returned, still out of work and the family was cut off from assistance while he was looking for a job.

"I'm not putting all the blame on other people," she said. "He didn't face up enough to his responsibility. But I believe work is his biggest problem."

"All he talks about now is getting a job, getting settled down. I guess he realized he has hurt me a lot and the children. He is crazy about them. Right now we are on assistance but when he gets out in August we'll be cut off again and if he can't get work right away, I don't know what will happen."

A 33-year-old father of nine children, who can't read enough to decipher street addresses, described to Family and Child Services of Washington how his handicap prevents his holding a job. He is enrolled in an adult literacy course.

A caseworker said he cannot find a job as a floor finisher, his only skill, because he is a Negro. So he takes odd jobs that don't pay enough to support his family.

Said the worker, "this family has interior strengths of love, good standards, no delinquency or marital problems. If the city had a welfare program where he could be trained for work and placed, while his family received assistance, they could maintain the kind of stable home which they have managed to do under the most adverse circumstances.

Mr. RIBICOFF subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators MORSE, TYDINGS, PROXMIRE, MCINTYRE, and KENNEDY of New York, be added as cosponsors of amendment No. 281, submitted by me today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 282 AND 283

Mr. PELL submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance sys-

tem, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH-SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1588) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes, at the next printing of that measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be added as a sponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 85, the resolution I introduced on May 24 proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to equal rights for men and women, and that his name be listed as one of the sponsors at the next printing of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JEFFERSON NATIONAL EXPANSION MEMORIAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 308.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1576) to amend the act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), as amended, providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of the old St. Louis, Mo., and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 320), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The purpose of the bill is to provide for an increase in the appropriation authorization from $17,250,000 to $23,250,000 for the completion of the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

HISTORY

On June 15, 1934, the Congress established the U.S. Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, to formulate plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial to the westward expansion of the Nation. Actual clearing of the site of old St. Louis began in 1935 with a Federal appropriation of $6,750,000 and $2,250,000 contributed on a 3-to-1 matching basis by the city of St. Louis.

The concept of westward expansion, the Louisiana Purchase, and all it meant to the growth of America and development of our Nation into the great country it is today required a memorial design suitable to the occasion. In 1947, the Commission chose such a design—a museum, grand center steps, and visitor center design of Architect Eero Saarinen, dominated by a 630-foot-high stainless steel gateway arch facing the Mississippi River.

By the act of 1954, Congress authorized appropriations for the construction of the memorial. By this and subsequent actions, Congress has authorized and appropriated $17,250,000 in Federal funds for the project, stipulating that expenditures be made on the basis of 3 Federal dollars for every 1 non-Federal (city of St. Louis and other sources) dollar made available.

In order to complete the project a further expenditure of about $8 million is needed on the same cost-sharing basis. The city of St. Louis has assured the Park Service of its intent to continue to participate in sharing the cost of completion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1576) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of May 17, 1954 (68 Stat. 98), entitled "An Act to provide for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of old Saint Louis, Missouri, in general accordance with the plan approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes," as amended by the Act of September 6, 1958 (72 Stat. 1794), is hereby further amended by striking the figure $17,250,000" from section 4 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the figure "$23,250,000."

ASSATEAGUE ISLAND NATIONAL SEASHORE, MD. AND VA.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 319, Senate bill 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 20) to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 7, after "NS–AI–7100A,", to insert "November 1964","; on page 3, line 10, after the word "Secretary", to strike out "not required for other Federal purposes"; on page 4, line 12, after the word "owner.", to strike out "The term 'improved property' as used in this Act shall mean any single family residence the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1963, and such amount of land, not in excess of three acres, on which the building is situated as the Secretary considers reasonably necessary to the noncommercial residential use of the building: *Provided,* That the Secretary may exclude from improved properties any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public access thereto" and insert "The term 'improved property' as used in this Act shall mean (1) any single-family residence the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1963, and such amount of land, not in excess of three acres, on which the building is situated as the Secretary considers reasonably necessary to the noncommercial residential use of the building, and (2) any property fronting on the Chincoteague Bay or Sinepuxtent Bay including the offshore bay islands adjacent thereto, that are used chiefly for hunting and continues in such use and in the same ownership: *Provided* that the Secretary may exclude from improved properties any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public use or public access thereto"; on page 8, line 15, after the word "uses", to insert "in accordance"; on page 10, after line 2, to strike out:

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 9. There are hereby authorized to construct a suitable road on Assateague Island from the Chincoteague-Assateague Bridge in the State of Virginia to the existing public beach and through the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge to connect with the Sandy Point-Assateague Bridge in the State of Maryland.

And after line 11, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 10. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sums of not more than $16,250,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than $7,765,000 for the development of the area authorized under this Act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purpose of protecting and developing Assateague Island in the States of Maryland and Virginia and certain adjacent waters and small marsh islands for public outdoor recreation and use and enjoyment, the Assateague Island National Seashore (hereinafter referred to as the "seashore") shall be established and administered in accordance with the provisions of this Act. The seashore shall comprise the area within Assateague Island and the small marsh islands adjacent thereto, together with the adjacent water areas not more than one-half mile beyond the mean high waterline of the land portions as generally depicted on a map identified as "Proposed Assateague Island National Seashore, Boundary Map, NS–AI–7100A, November 1964", which map shall be on file and available for public inspection

in the offices of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 2. (a) Within the boundaries of the seashore, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to acquire lands, waters, and other property, or any interest therein, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, exchange, or by such other method as he may find to be in the public interest. The Secretary is authorized to acquire, by any of the above methods, not to exceed ten acres of land or interests therein on the mainland for an administrative site. In the case of acquisition by negotiated purchase, the property owners shall be paid the fair market value by the Secretary. Any property of interests therein owned by the States of Maryland or Virginia shall be acquired only with the concurrence of such owner. Notwithstanding any other provision of the law, any Federal property located within the boundaries of the seashore and not more than ten acres of Federal property on the mainland may, with the concurrence of the agency having custody thereof, be transferred without consideration to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for purposes of the seashore.

(b) When acquiring lands by exchange, the Secretary may accept title to any non-Federal property within the boundaries of the seashore and to not more than ten acres of non-Federal property on the mainland, and convey to the grantor of such property and federally owned property under the jurisdiction of the Secretary which he classifies as suitable for exchange or other disposal. The properties so exchanged shall be approximately equal in fair market value, but the Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to acquire all of the right, title, or interest of the Chincoteague-Assateague Bridge and Beach Authority, a political subdivision of the State of Virginia, in the bridge constructed by such authority across the Assateague Channel, together with all lands or interests therein, roads, parking lots, buildings, or other real or personal property of such authority and to compensate the authority in such amount as will permit it to meet its valid outstanding obligations at the time of such acquisition. Payments by the Secretary shall be on such terms and conditions as he shall consider to be in the public interest. Any of the aforesaid property outside the boundaries of the national seashore upon acquisition by the Secretary, shall be subject to his administration for purposes of the seashore.

(d) Owners of improved property acquired by the Secretary may reserve for themselves and their successors or assigns a right of use and occupancy of the improved property for noncommercial residential purposes for a term that is not more than twenty-five years. In such cases, the Secretary shall pay to the owner of the property the fair market value thereof less the fair market value of the right retained by such owner. The term improved property as used in this Act shall mean (1) any single-family residence the construction of which was begun before January 1, 1963, and such amount of land, not in excess of three acres, on which the building is situated as the Secretary considers reasonably necessary to the noncommercial residential use of the building, and (2) any property fronting on the Chincoteague Bay or Sinepuxtent Bay including the offshore bay islands adjacent thereto, that are used chiefly for hunting and continues in such use and in the same ownership: *Provided*, That the Secretary may exclude from improved properties any marsh, beach, or waters, together with so much of the land adjoining such marsh, beach, or waters as he deems necessary for public use or public access thereto.

SEC. 3. (a) If the bridge from Sandy Point to Assateague Island is operated by the State of Maryland as a toll-free facility, the Secretary is authorized and directed to compensate said State in the amount of two-thirds of the cost of constructing the bridge, including the cost of bridge approaches, engineering, and all other related costs, but the total amount of such compensation shall be not more than $1,000,000; and he is authorized to enter into agreements with the State of Maryland relating to the use and management of the bridge.

(b) The State of Maryland shall have the right to acquire or lease from the United States such land or interest therein on the island north of the area now used as a State park as the State may from time to time determine to be needed for State park purposes; and the Secretary is authorized and directed to convey or lease such land or interest therein to the State for such purposes upon terms and conditions which he deems will assure its public use in harmony with the purposes of this Act. In the event any of such terms and conditions are not complied with, all the property, or any portion thereof, shall, at the option of the Secretary, revert to the United States in its then existing condition. Any lease hereunder shall be for such consideration as the Secretary deems equitable; and any conveyance of title to land hereunder may be made only upon payment by the State of such amounts of money as were expended by the United States to acquire such land, or interest therein, and upon payment of such amounts as will reimburse the United States for the cost of any improvements placed thereon by the United States, including the cost to it of beach protection: *Provided*, That reimbursement for beach protection shall not exceed 30 per centum, as determined by the Secretary, of the total cost to the United States of such protection work.

SEC. 4. When the Secretary determines that land, water areas, or interests therein within the area generally depicted on the map referred to in section 1 are owned or have been acquired by the United States in sufficient quantities to provide an administrable unit, he shall declare the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore by publication of notice thereof in the Federal Register. Such notice shall contain a refined description or map of the boundaries of the seashore as the Secretary may find desirable, and the exterior boundaries shall encompass an area as nearly as practicable identical to the area described in section 1 of this Act.

SEC. 5. The Secretary shall permit hunting and fishing on land and waters under his control within the seashore in accordance with the appropriate State laws, to the extent applicable, except that the Secretary may designate zones where, and establish periods when, no hunting or fishing shall be permitted for reasons of public safety, administration, fish or wildlife management, or public use and enjoyment: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall limit or interfere with the authority of the States to permit or to regulate shellfishing in any waters included in the national seashore. Except in emergencies, any regulations of the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be put into effect only after consultation with the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities. The provisions of this section shall not apply to the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

SEC. 6. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall administer the Assateague Island National Seashore for general purposes of public outdoor recreation, including conservation of natural features contributing to public enjoyment. In the administration of the seashore and the administrative site the Secretary may utilize such statutory authorities relating to areas administered and supervised by the Secretary through the National Park Service and such statutory authority otherwise available to him for the conservation and management of natural resources as he deems appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, land and waters in the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, which are a part of the seashore, shall be administered for refuge purposes under laws and regulations applicable to national wildlife refuges, including administration for public recreation uses in accordance with the provisions of the Act of September 28, 1962 (76 Stat. 653).

SEC. 7. (a) In order that suitable overnight and other public accommodations on Assateague Island will be provided for visitors to the seashore, the Secretary is authorized to select and set aside not to exceed six hundred acres having a suitable elevation in the area south of the island terminus of the bridge constructed by the State of Maryland, and to provide such land fill within the area selected as he deems necessary to permit and protect permanent construction work thereon.

(b) Within the area designated under subsection (a) the Secretary shall permit the construction by private persons of suitable overnight and other public accommodations for visitors to the seashore, under such terms and conditions as he deems necessary in the public interest. Such terms and conditions shall include, but not be limited to, the right of the Secretary to approve all plans for the facility and to impose restrictions on the use thereof.

(c) The site of any facility constructed under authority of this section shall remain the property of the United States; however, each such privately owned overnight or other accommodation facility shall be subject to taxation by the State and the political subdivisions thereof in which such facility is located.

(d) The Secretary shall make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out this section.

(e) Nothing in this section shall be deemed to restrict or limit any other authority of the Secretary relating to the administration of the seashore.

SEC. 8. The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of the Army shall cooperate in the study and formulation of plans for beach erosion control and hurricane protection of the seashore; and any such protective works that are undertaken by the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, shall be carried out in accordance with a plan that is acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior and is consistent with the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior shall construct a suitable road on Assateague Island from the Chincoteague-Assateague Bridge in the State of Virginia to the existing public beach and through the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge to connect with the Sandy Point-Assateague Bridge in the State of Maryland.

SEC. 10. There are hereby auhorized to be appropriated the sums of not more than $16,250,000 for the acquisition of lands and interests in lands and not more than $7,765,000 for the development of the area authorized under this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 331), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The proposed Assateague Island National Seashore contains 39,630 acres, consisting of 19,096 acres of land and 20,534 acres of water or submerged lands. Approximately 9,453 acres of the land on the island is in Federal ownership, 922 acres in State ownership, and 8,721 in private ownership.

The present state of development on Assateague Island, proceeding from north to south, is as follows:

The northern 6 miles of the island consist of two large tracts, one of which has been subdivided and another containing a private lodge, dwelling and boathouse, a dock and lesser structures. Otherwise, the northern 6 miles is devoid of improvements.

Next, the newly acquired Maryland State park lands comprise 692 acres and occupy about 2 miles of ocean shoreline. The State park area has a few temporary facilities and is accessible by a newly constructed bridge from Sandy Point to the island.

The next 14 miles of the island, from the State park to the Maryland-Virginia State line, contain a subdivision of 5,850 lots now owned by an estimated 3,200 individuals, plus several other privately owned tracts. There are 16 summer cottages, 17 gun clubs, and a few other structures in this area. This stretch also includes 418 acres of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

The major portion of the refuge, authorized in 1943 and administered by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, occupies the southern third of Assateague Island. It is about 13 miles in length and contains 9,030 acres more in Virginia. Until recently the development of the refuge was confined principally to impoundments for feeding, resting, and nesting of migratory waterfowl. In 1962, a toll bridge constructed by the Chincoteague-Assateague Bridge & Beach Authority was opened to the public. The authority leases from the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife 4 miles of the island, including the "hook." It is being developed as a day use recreation area. A restaurant, a bathhouse, restrooms, and a parking area have recently been built here. An active Coast Guard station is located in the southern hook.

The preliminary development plans for the proposed national seashore, from north to south, are as follows:

1. Inlet jetty area: This area, located adjacent to the Ocean City inlet, would provide facilities for surf and jetty fishing and for picnicking. Access would be by foot trails or by boat.

2. Maryland State park: The State would develop, maintain, and administer this park as an intensive use area. It has already developed temporary facilities for camping and bathing and intends to build several bathhouses, beach facilities, picnicking and camping facilities, a restaurant, a marina, riding stables, and other recreation facilities.

3. Concession area: This proposed development would be immediately south of the State park and would contain about 600 acres of land and a mile and a half of ocean beach frontage. The land would be owned by the United States but the buildings and other facilities would be provided by private capital and operated under a concession contract with the Federal Government.

4. Sinepuxent Neck area: The Department proposes to acquire a 10-acre area on the mainland as a site for the seashore's administrative headquarters. This would be the point of first contact and orientation for most seashore visitors. Developments here would include a visitor center, the park headquarters, and the park residence and maintenance area.

5. Lumber Marsh area: This would be the first of the three major recreational areas to be operated by the National Park Service. Beach access and facilities for swimming and picnicking would be provided.

6. Sugar Point area: This area would be similar to the Lumber Marsh area, with provision of beach access and facilities for swimming and picnicking.

7. Green Run Bay area: Planned to be more completely developed than Lumber Marsh or Sugar Point, the Green Run Bay area would provide a visitor contact station, a marina, swimming facilities, camping and picnicking facilities, and interpretive trails.

8. Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge: The Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will develop and operate recreation facilities in the refuge under existing authority and the Assateague Island National Seashore legislation. A major development near the present restaurant and several small beach shelters along the hook are contemplated. Interpretive services and a visitor center would be provided at refuge headquarters near the bridge.

In summary, the area will consist of 39,630 acres—about an equal amount of land and water—with over half of the land already in Federal ownership. The island would provide 35 miles of excellent ocean beach. There are 16 summer cottages and a permanent residence on the area. Three major recreational areas are proposed for development in addition to the Maryland State park development and the concession area which will be developed by private interests. At the southerly end of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, recreation facilities will also be developed and operated. The island would be used primarily for swimming, picnicking, fishing, camping, and marinas, and overnight accommodations would be provided. The area would accommodate 3 million visitors annually during the initial stages of development. Land acquisition costs are estimated at $16,250,000 and development costs at $7,765,000.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the Senate is now considering my bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia.

This bill was carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Senate Interior Committee under the able leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE]. It gained the unanimous support of that subcommittee after they made several technical amendments and included a provision for a road from the existing bridge in Maryland to the one in Virginia. The inclusion of this road was urged by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Recognizing the urgent need for action, the full Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs unanimously reported S. 20 as amended.

Today is a great day for the many people who have been actively engaged in trying to preserve Assateague Island in its natural state. It is also a great day for the millions of people, now and in the future, who will seek Assateague's clean, white beaches to escape from the daily hustle and bustle of the growing megalopolis which is rapidly extending itself from Richmond, Va., to Boston, Mass.

For the benefit of my distinguished colleagues, I would like to recap briefly some of the history of this legislation before us today.

The purpose of this bill is to provide for the development of Assateague Island and certain adjacent waters and small marsh islands for public outdoor recreation. It would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire lands, waters, and other property, and to administer these for the general purposes of public outdoor recreation and conservation. The natural features of the island would be retained for the benefit of the public.

Assateague Island is a low, narrow, undeveloped barrier reef approximately 32 miles in length, lying parallel to the coasts of Maryland and Virginia, separated from the mainland of these States by Sinepuxent and Chincoteague Bays.

But Assateague Island is more than this—it is the largest remaining undeveloped seashore between Cape Cod and Cape Hatteras. It is one of the very few remaining such areas in this country. Within a 250-mile radius of Assateague is to be found one-fifth of the population of the United States—about 33½ million people. Almost one-fourth of this number live within a 3-hour drive of the island.

Thus, Assateague Island represents one of our last opportunities to acquire a sizable seashore for public benefit.

Mr. President, these are the simple geographic facts which motivated my introduction of this legislation. There are, however, additional factors which influenced my decision on this matter.

For almost three decades, the outstanding recreational values of Assateague Island have been recognized. A 1935 survey of the National Park Service included Assateague as one of the 12 areas along the Atlantic coast to be preserved for public use and enjoyment. In 1943, the Virginia portion of the island was acquired by the Federal Government, and established as the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge.

In 1955, the National Park Service made a restudy of the Atlantic coast, but made no recommendations with respect to Assateague Island because, at that time, the 14 miles of the island immediately north of the Virginia line were being extensively subdivided by private developers, and it appeared that the opportunity to preserve the natural and untapped recreational resources of the island for the public had been lost.

In 1961, the Maryland General Assembly authorized the State roads commission to construct a bridge connecting Assateague Island with the mainland of Worcester County. The State subsequently acquired 640 acres with 2 miles of ocean frontage for development as a State park, and declared its intention to acquire the remaining 7 miles of the island to the north for similar development.

Tidal storms of 1962–63 focused increased attention on Assateague Island, and pointed up the urgent need for beach front stabilization and other protective work if the barrier reef was to be preserved in any form for development purposes.

In June of 1962, Maryland Governor Tawes and Interior Secretary Udall

agreed to a joint study for purposes of determining the most feasible future utilization of the superb recreational opportunities offered by Assateague Island.

The following spring, the newly created Bureau of Outdoor Recreation published its report recommending the acquisition of Assateague Island for public recreational use. At the same time, contracts were let and construction began on the bridge. The cost of the bridge was to be borne jointly by Worcester County and the State of Maryland.

Since the filing of the report by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, intensive study of the proposals embodied in this report, and endorsed by the Secretary of the Interior, has been carried on by the appropriate agencies of the State government. In addition to these studies, public hearings have been held to permit all interested parties to be heard. Innumerable meetings have taken place between representatives of private property owners on Assateague Island, officials of Worcester County, State officials, and representatives of the Department of the Interior. These meetings have included several inspections tours of the island itself.

The Maryland Department of Forests and Parks, under the able leadership of its chairman, Mr. S. L. Hammerman, recommended public development of the island. Similar recommendations have been made by the Maryland Economic Development Commission and the Maryland State Department of Planning. The Maryland Board of Public Works, the State's highest authority in this field, unanimously approved the concept of public development of Assateague Island.

That the various State boards, agencies, and officials concurred in their approval of a plan for Assateague Island which embodies public development jointly by the State and the Federal Governments is a tribute to their foresight in these matters.

The studies which I made of the reports issued by the Department of the Interior, the agencies of the State of Maryland, and the Worcester County Commissioners, including the pertinent engineering analysis, convinced me that the future of this island demands exclusive public development.

Wise conservation and development of our natural resources today will return vast dividends tomorrow. Each failure to act now is an opportunity lost forever. The task of preserving our natural resources becomes more acute each day. To conserve and preserve what is left, and to reclaim some of what has been lost, is an obligation which we owe to ourselves and to future generations. We must continually bear in mind that we are only trustees of a rich and bounteous heritage found in the natural resources of our land.

The rapid rate of our population expansion makes it imperative that we act now to preserve for the residents of our cities, our suburbs, and our towns the recreation areas which will enrich the lives of their inhabitants.

Many of the challenges in the development of adequate recreational facilities are best met at the State and local level. Maryland officials are to be congratulated for their continuing efforts in this regard—efforts which, in the case of Assateague Island, have already brought about the acquisition of parts of that island for State park purposes, and the letting of contracts for bridge construction.

Only through further public development can we hope to preserve what is a precious possession not only of Worcester County but of the Nation. Only through public development will the necessary Federal funds and techniques be available for beach stabilization and protection. Only through public development can we hope to provide the large metropolitan area between Philadelphia and Washington with an unparalleled recreational opportunity. Only through public development can Maryland take advantage of the unrivaled publicity and promotional facilities of the Department of the Interior—facilities which have increased the number of visitors to the Hatteras National Seashore, with no nearby metropolitan area, by 500 percent in a period of 10 years; facilities which can be expected to bring 3 million visitors a year to the Assateague National Seashore by 1975. Only through public development can we expect to provide for the greatest economic benefit to Worcester County and to Maryland from this, one of its most valuable assets.

A national seashore at Assateague will serve as a magnet for visitors which will increase each year. In view of the plans of the Department of the Interior for only minimum facilities on the island itself, the areas adjacent to the island will acquire an enormous potential for private development and growth. With this in mind, it is not too early for the citizens and officials of Worcester County, with the assistance of the State, to begin the preparation of a master plan for the development of facilities along the bay side of the county to service the island.

Mr. President, in conclusion let me urge the Senate's favorable action on this legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am delighted that S. 20, the bill to establish the Assateague National Seashore Park, is before the Senate for final passage. I would like to commend my distinguished senior colleague, Senator BREWSTER, for his outstanding leadership in introducing this bill and effectively shepherding it toward final passage.

All Maryland, indeed, the Nation, owes a debt of gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the Parks and Recreation Subcommittee of the Senate Interior Committee, the Senator from Nevada, Senator BIBLE. I serve under Senator BIBLE on the Senate District Committee and know of his outstanding abilities as a chairman and know he is one of the most effective Members of this body.

Individuals and groups concerned with recreation and conservation have been interested in Assateague Island since at least 1935. The island is a wide, unbroken beach shelving gradually into the ocean and with no undertow. It offers surf fishing, safe swimming, and fine clamming. The bay side marshes are a famous haunt of waterfowl. Assateague Island ponies, thought to be descended from stock that escaped from a 16th-century Spanish galleon, are known to every person who has read the famous childhood story, "Misty."

The island is well situated for development as a recreation site. It is almost equidistant from the great Middle Atlantic cities of Philadelphia, Wilmington, Baltimore, Washington, and Norfolk, all of which lie within a radius of 150 miles. There is no other national park within easy driving distance of these great urban areas.

The time is long since passed, Mr. President, when our country can fail to preserve those areas of natural beauty that have escaped the bulldozer and the plow.

For many years the vastness of our country postponed any consideration of the preservation of special areas as unspoiled wilderness and recreational lands. During the frontier era Americans could deal with forest and stream in the most careless fashion and harm no one.

As the frontier disappeared and the continental United States became organized, the Federal Government recognized the importance of public lands. A century and a half ago it established the General Land Office to administer a vast system of forests, parks, and wilderness areas, almost entirely in the Western United States.

Local governments soon followed with long-range planning for land use through zoning laws, country land-use plans, development of greenbelts around growing cities, withholding of land from private use for schools, golf courses, watersheds, airports, and so on.

In the thirties and forties the crises of depression and war postponed consideration of the need for preservation of unspoiled wilderness and recreational areas.

Now in the sixties, with mercurial speed we have become an urban society, nearly 200 million, with shamefully despoiled water, land and air, with decaying cities and commercial engulfment of all open areas. America is rapidly becoming a place not only unpleasant for human life, but devoid of space or place for men to pause, to play, to contemplate.

This is especially characteristic of the Eastern United States with its dense megalopolis stretching from Washington to Boston.

In Assateague Island there is available an opportunity to preserve for public use a lovely 33-mile strip of virgin seashore, the only one of this size remaining along the entire east coast from Cape Cod to Cape Hatteras.

I am convinced that passage of S. 20 will enrich my State and our country. I believe that we should aspire not only to the Great Society but to a gracious and beauty-loving society.

I wholeheartedly offer my support for this bill.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to present to the Senate S. 20, the bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore.

The Parks and Recreation Subcommittee, of which I am chairman, as well as the full Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee were unanimous in reporting the bill now before you.

After 4 days of hearings and an inspection of the area on the ground, the members were well acquainted with the unique value of the island for a recreation area to serve the millions of people on the east coast who are in need of such a facility.

The island, lying both in Maryland and Virginia, extends for 35 miles along the Atlantic coastline from Ocean City to Chincoteague Inlet. Its wide, gentle, sloping, clean white beach and low dunes should make a substantial contribution to those of our citizens who seek outdoor recreation.

I particularly want to congratulate my distinguished colleagues, Senator ROBERTSON, of Virginia, and Senators BREWSTER and TYDINGS, of Maryland, for the interest and enthusiasm they have displayed in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. Without their very valuable assistance and testimony this measure would not be here today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there is no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 20) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BREWSTER subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate passed legislation designed to establish a national seashore on Assateague Island, Md.

The Senate action came on a voice vote 1 year, 9 months, and 7 days after the bill's original introduction in September 1963. Today's vote represents the culmination of years of effort by many of us to preserve this wild island for our citizens.

In the effort which we have been making, I and my colleagues in the Congress have had the support of thousands of Marylanders. We have had the support of distinguished conservationists and conservation groups. We have also had the unswerving support of newspapers, television, and radio stations who sought to assist us in the protection of the public interest.

Mr. President, I should like to pay tribute and say "Thank you" to these organizations for their assistance. Much of the credit for what has been accomplished belongs to them. A fine example of the support we have enjoyed can be found in the editorial columns of the Baltimore Sun during this past week.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two editorials on Assateague which appeared in the Sun be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Evening Sun]

ASSATEAGUE MOVEMENT

The case for making Assateague a national seashore park is by now a familiar one in Maryland. It has been argued again and again. The fact that the island is the one remaining natural area of its kind along the east coast, its proximity to the heavily populated Baltimore-Washington urban complex, the presence of an already existing wildlife refuge, the shabby alternative of commercial development of the island—all these have become almost commonplaces. Except for a few with a vested interest in private development, most Marylanders accept the arguments as valid.

If Assateague is to become a national park, however, Washington must be convinced as well. A great step forward was taken when both the Interior Department and President Johnson threw their support to national development. All that remains is for Congress to act and welcome movement to that end occurred yesterday with approval by the Senate Interior Committee's subcommittee on parks and recreation of the $17 million proposal. The favorable subcommittee report makes support by the full committee almost certain. Action by the Senate itself should come reasonably soon.

Unless Senate action is followed by speedy approval in the House, however, the whole plan could be imperiled. The bridge linking Assateague to the mainland, opened last year, has given a large boost to private development. If the cost of land to the Federal Government is not to become prohibitively expensive, Congress will have to act at this session. Hearings before the House Interior Committee are scheduled to begin shortly. The case for a national park on Assateague remains just as strong as it always was. But Maryland's House delegation will have to give the bill the same strong support that it got in the Senate from Senators BREWSTER and TYDINGS if there are to be no slip-ups. Now that Congress is moving, the momentum must be maintained.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 4, 1965]

NEXT ON ASSATEAGUE

Now that the bill to make Assateague Island a national seashore has received the unanimous approval of the Senate Interior Committee, attention shifts at least for the moment to the House, where a companion measure is before the House Interior Committee headed by Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado. The bill in that Chamber did not get off to the most favorable of starts this last weekend when Representative ASPINALL and five other Congressmen toured the island and were confronted by some Worcester Countians and other lot owners who oppose the creation of a public seashore and want the island to remain open to private building.

A subsequent report has indicated that Representative ASPINALL, for one, got the impression that the opposition to a national seashore was greater than it actually is and that some compromise would be necessary. The Eastern Shore's own Representative MORTON for his part put the opposition in the best possible light under the circumstances by explaining that the lot owners had continued to pay taxes year after year, never knowing for certain whether they could build on their lots or not, and that they deserved a prompt, hard-and-fast decision as to what is to become of the island.

The plight of the lot owners as presented by Mr. MORTON is a good argument for Mr. ASPINALL'S committee or a subcommittee thereof to start public hearings on the House bill just as soon as an open date makes it possible, so that the issue does not drag through another summer. Once the many proponents are heard, the limited opposition can be seen in its proper perspective, which rules out any need for compromise. But first there must be an early hearing date. Representative MORTON presumably can be counted on to press for early action, and if other members of the Maryland delegation are equally attentive, we might soon have a House committee vote to match the favorable committee vote in the Senate.

SOUTHERN NEVADA WATER PROJECT, NEVADA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 320, Senate bill 32.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 32) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 9, after the word "to", to strike out "consideration" and insert "conservation"; and on page 5, line 1, after "Sec. 7.", to strike out "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act." and insert "There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, the sum of $81,003,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902; 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto), except as those laws are inconsistent with this Act, for the principal purpose of delivering water for municipal, industrial, and incidental irrigation use. The principal features of the southern Nevada water project shall consist of intake facilities, pumping plants, aqueduct and laterals, transmission lines, substations, and storage and regulatory facilities required to provide water from Lake Mead on the Colorado River for distribution to municipalities and industrial centers within Clark County, Nevada.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary shall make appropriate allocations of project costs to municipal and industrial water supply and, if appropriate, to conservation: *Provided,* That all operation and maintenance costs for the

southern Nevada water project shall be allocated to municipal and industrial water supply. Construction costs of said dam and reservoir allocated to conservation shall be nonreimbursable.

(b) Allocations of project costs made to municipal and industrial water supply shall be repayable to the United States under either the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws or under the provisions of Water Supply Act of 1958 (title III of Public Law 85-500, 72 Stat. 319 and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto): *Provided*, That, in either case, repayment of costs allocated to municipal and industrial water supply shall include interest on the unamortized balance of such allocations at a rate equal to the average rate (which rate shall be certified by the Secretary of the Treasury) paid by the United States on its marketable long-term securities outstanding on the date of this Act and adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of 1 per centum.

(c) If conditions permit irrigation use of project water, the Secretary is authorized to allocate to irrigation, under the provisions of the Federal reclamation laws, an appropriate portion of the project construction costs allocated to municipal and industrial *water supply*.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into the necessary contract, or contracts, with the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, acting for the State of Nevada, for the delivery of water and for repayment of the reimbursable construction costs, notwithstanding provisions of section 5 of the Boulder Canyon Act (45 Stat. 1057).

(b) Construction of the project shall not be commenced until a suitable contract has been executed by the Secretary and the Colorado River Commission.

(c) Such contract may be entered into without regard to the last sentence of section 9, subsection (c), of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, and may recognize the relative priorities of municipal, industrial, and irrigation uses.

(d) Upon execution of the contract referred to in section 3(a) above, and upon completion of construction of the project, the Secretary shall transfer to said Colorado River Commission of Nevada the care, operation, and maintenance of the intake, pumping plants, aqueducts, reservoirs, and related features of the southern Nevada water project upon the terms and conditions set out in the said contract.

(e) When all of the costs allocable to reimbursable purposes incurred by the United States on constructing, operating, and maintaining the project, together with appropriate interest charges, have been returned to the United States by the Colorado River Commission of Nevada, said commission shall have the permanent right to use the intake, pumping plants, aqueducts, reservoirs, and related features of the southern Nevada water supply project in accordance with said contract.

SEC. 4. Such amount of the costs of construction as are allocated to the furnishing of a water supply to Nellis Air Force Base or other defense installations shall be nonreimbursable.

SEC. 5. Expenditures for the southern Nevada water project may be made without regard to the soil survey and land classification requirements of the Interior Department Appropriation Act of 1954 (43 U.S.C. 390a).

SEC. 6. The use of all water diverted for this project from the Colorado River system shall be subject to and controlled by the Colorado River compact, the Boulder Canyon Project Act (45 Stat. 1057; U.S.C. 617t), and the Mexican Water Treaty (Treaty Series 994) (59 Stat. 1219).

SEC. 7. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for construction of the southern Nevada water project, Nevada, the sum of $81,003,000 plus or minus such amounts, if any, as may be justified by reason of ordinary fluctuations in construction costs as indicated by engineering cost indexes applicable to the types of construction involved herein.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 332), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

Purpose of S. 32, which is sponsored by the two Senators from Nevada, Senators BIBLE and CANNON, is to authorize construction of a municipal and industrial water supply project in populous and rapidly developing Clark County, Nev., containing more than half of the State's population. The cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, and Boulder City will be served by the facilities as will Nellis Air Force Base, the Atomic Energy Commission installation, and the El Dorado Valley as a whole.

Water for the purposes of S. 32 will come from nearby Lake Mead, the approximately 29 million acre-foot reservoir created by Hoover Dam. The initial stage of the southern Nevada project will divert a maximum of 132,000 acre-feet, with a total net diversion for all three stages of 262,000 acre-feet. This amount is well within Nevada's 300,000 acre-foot entitlement under the decree of the Supreme Court of the United States in the *Arizona* case (*Arizona* v. *California*, 376 U.S. 340, 342).

The committee wishes to emphasize the fact that the water to be allocated to the southern Nevada water project is in no way to be deemed to effect or impair other allocations that may be made from Nevada's entitlement from the Colorado River; that is, S. 32 would not preclude allocations that may be needed for other Nevada projects.

The southern Nevada project will be constructed in three stages. The project is wholly reimbursable, with interest, within a 50-year period. The benefit-cost ratio for the first stage is the favorable one of 1.5 to 1 and, for the project as a whole, 1.6 to 1.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, we often hear the word "vital" applied to legislation passing through this Chamber. In this instance, the word is particularly appropriate. It can be applied forcefully and effectively to the southern Nevada water supply project which Senate bill 32 will authorize. Not only is the legislation vital, but it is vital that we continue to move ahead rapidly with it so that construction can begin as quickly as possible.

The southern Nevada water supply project, in brief, is a pumping and pipeline project that will enable Nevada to benefit from its allotment of Colorado River water. It will bring this water from Lake Mead to the cities of Boulder City, Henderson, Las Vegas, and North Las Vegas, to Nellis Air Force Base and the El Dorado Valley for municipal and industrial use.

I have stressed the word "vital" as applied to this undertaking because I want to emphasize the critical water problems that are involved. Southern Nevada, the fastest growing area in one of the fastest growing States, has relied almost entirely on underground water. The experts tell us these underground resources are being rapidly depleted by the demands of increasing population and in many instances are nearing exhaustion.

Upon the availability of adequate water depends the continued economic health and future growth of southern Nevada. The project authorized in this bill will fill that requirement at least for the immediate foreseeable future.

The waters drawn from the Colorado River will come from within the 300,000 acre-feet yearly allocated to Nevada in the recent Supreme Court ruling in the case of Arizona against California. To date, my State has been unable to benefit from this allocation and use this badly needed water.

These are factors which underscore the word "vital" as applied to the southern Nevada water supply project. Another factor is time. We have been working on this legislation since 1959. However, it was impossible to proceed until the Colorado River water allocations were finally adjudicated. This did not occur until March of 1964. An authorization was favorably reported by the Senate Interior Committee last year but it did not reach a vote before adjournment. Meanwhile—and this is difficult to believe—the population of southern Nevada within Clark County has continued to grow at a rate that has doubled the number of inhabitants just since the 1960 census. So the project is already long overdue and time is of the essence.

This project has had especially thorough consideration and was unanimously reported by the Senate Interior Committee. It should be noted that the project has an excellent benefit-cost ratio of 1.5 to 1 for the initial phase and 1.6 to 1 for the ultimate phase.

The cost of this undertaking—some $49 million for the initial phase—is completely reimbursable from revenues derived from the delivery of water to southern Nevada users, with interest. The Nevada State Legislature granted authority 2 years ago to the State's Colorado River Commission to contract with the United States for the repayment and to operate and maintain the project when it is in service.

This project has full and unhesitating support from every level of State and local government in my State and also from all responsible civic and business groups.

I urge support for this vital project so that the Congress can complete action on it as quickly as possible and hasten the day it can benefit the robust economy of southern Nevada.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I join my distinguished senior colleague from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] in urging the Senate to act favorably on passage of S. 32 to authorize the southern Nevada water supply project.

My colleague has done yeoman's work in pressing for the enactment of this vital legislation and has eloquently outlined the need for the authorization of this vital project.

The growth and prosperity of Nevada and the entire Southwest is irrevocably tied to adequate water development. There is no doubt in my mind that the Congress realizes the critical need to move and move rapidly to meet the Nation's demand for water for the future.

This was illustrated just yesterday, Mr. President, when the Senate gave its wholehearted support to the passage of S. 24 to greatly increase the commitment of this Nation to accelerated research in the field of desalinization. I feel that a massive effort to advance desalting technology, the support of the Congress for various water development projects such as the project now before the Senate, and programs to finance research in weather modifications will help alleviate the water shortage problems that will face this Nation in the very near future.

The southern Nevada water supply project is designed to meet the very immediate needs of southern Nevada and on its passage rest the aspirations of an area of my State in which nearly 50 percent of the population resides.

All costs would be allocated to municipal and industrial water users and would be reimbursable by the beneficiaries over a 50-year period. It is important to point out, Mr. President, that the project has a first-stage benefit-cost ratio of 1.5 to 1, and a favorable ratio of 1.6 to 1 for the ultimate phase.

There is a critical water supply problem in southern Nevada and the southern Nevada water supply project is vital to protect and conserve the dwindling ground water resources of Clark County and to provide a sure additional supply of water to serve one of the fastest growing areas in the United States. In less than 15 years the population of southern Nevada has grown from approximately 50,000 to more than a quarter of a million, and it is expected that nearly 1 million persons will reside in southern Nevada by the year 2000.

Thousands upon thousands of persons have invested their lives and fortunes in southern Nevada and they need—and must have—water if they are to survive and continue to prosper.

It is important to point out, Mr. President, that authorization and construction of the southern Nevada water supply project will in no way interfere with the orderly plans for other water development projects in the arid Southwestern States. Financially and technically, the southern Nevada water supply project has independence and feasibility.

The project enjoys the support of all interested parties in the State—the Governor, the congressional delegation, and all municipalities and city groups located in the area.

The Nevada State Legislature recently designated the Colorado River Commission of Nevada as the State agency to contract with the Federal Government for the repayment of project costs and to operate and maintain the project after construction.

If adequate water supplies are not developed for southern Nevada in the very near future, there will be grave damage to our economy and our underground water supplies. Southern Nevada has reached the point in its development where the underground artesian basin can no longer support its population, its industry, and the large Government installations which have invested so heavily in the area.

The Senate Interior Committee recognized the critical need for this project by acting with speed and vigor and reported the bill with very minor amendments.

The bill enjoys widespread support. The project is needed; it is timely and reasonable; and it does not interfere with the larger plan for the Southwest.

Its passage is absolutely mandatory for the survival, growth, and prosperity of the people of southern Nevada and I ask the support of the Senate in making the dreams of full water resources for southern Nevada a reality.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 32) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

STATE DEPARTMENT ADVICE RELATIVE TO AMERICAN STUDENT INFORMATION SERVICE

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last summer, one of my young constituents, a college student, had an unhappy experience with a Luxembourg-based organization known as the American Student Information Service. In looking into her complaint, I obtained information which may be helpful to other American students who may contemplate employment of the type which she obtained last summer in Europe. The State Department has prepared a form letter in response to many inquiries it has received concerning the activities of ASIS.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS.

DEAR ——: Thank you for your recent communication about the American Student Information Service (ASIS). The Department of State has received numerous inquiries concerning the activities of this organization.

ASIS was established in Luxembourg in 1961 after having operated from Denmark and, subsequently, Germany. It is a private organization with no U.S. Government connections. To the best of our knowledge, ASIS is not organized under the laws of any American jurisdiction, although it is our understanding that the two principal officers are Americans. Most students traveling to Europe under ASIS auspices find employment in countries other than Luxembourg.

The American Embassy in Luxembourg reports that it has received numerous complaints about the organization from students. On several occasions the Embassy has tried on the students' behalf to discuss these complaints with the directors of ASIS but has found the latter to be "totally uncooperative." In view of this situation, the Department cannot recommend that American students participate in the ASIS program.

For information on summer employment, travel, or study programs abroad, you may wish to write to well-established, nonprofit agencies such as the Institute of International Education, 800 Second Avenue, New York, N.Y., 10017, or the Experiment in International Living, Putney, Vt. Our information indicates, however, that the majority of temporary job opportunities overseas call for volunteer service rather than for paid employment.

We enclose a copy of "Opportunities for Summer Employment Abroad," which suggests additional sources that may be helpful.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH B. SUTHERLAND,
Director, Public Information and Reports Staff.

SMALL BUSINESS VICTORY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, issued a statement with reference to a recent Supreme Court ruling which is of considerable interest to small business. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business, today hailed the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in sustaining the decision of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, Chicago, Ill., April 24, 1964, in the *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Goodyear-Atlantic Refining* case as a signal victory for small business.

The Court held the Federal Trade Commission has found an agreement between Atlantic Refining and Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. under which the former sponsors the sale of tires, batteries, and accessory products of the latter to the wholesale outlets and retail tire service dealers is an unfair method of competition in violation of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

This action of the Supreme Court, Burger stated, will free the Nation's 300,000 independent service station operators to purchase their tire, battery, and accessory products from suppliers of their own choice on a competitive price-quality basis.

He further advised these rubber company-oil company tie-in arrangements were first exposed in Senate Small Business Committee print No. 3, 1941, on facts presented by Mr. Burger to the committee.

This June 1 Supreme Court decision may well be looked upon as one of the most important actions under the antitrust laws in a quarter of a century, as it will apply to small business of this Nation.

"MORAL NEUTRALISM" AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee made a significant and widely reported speech in the Senate Wednesday on our Vietnam policy.

I regret that I was not on the floor at the time he made the speech.

I did not know that he was planning to make the statement; otherwise I would have adjusted my schedule in a manner that would have permitted my presence.

I am in wholehearted accord with many of the points made by the chairman in his statement. But there are portions of his statement which I found confusing and contradictory and dangerous in their implications.

The Senator from Arkansas spoke for all of us when he said that he was opposed to an unconditional American withdrawal from South Vietnam. He said:

> Such action would betray our obligation to people we have promised to defend * * * would weaken or destroy the credibility of *American guarantees* to other countries * * * and would encourage the view in Peiping and elsewhere, that guerrilla wars supported from the outside are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power.

I commend the Senator from this cogent statement on the consequences of an unconditional American withdrawal.

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee also performed a distinct service in reviewing the many efforts that have been made to persuade Peiping and Hanoi to come to the conference table in an effort to terminate the fighting in South Vietnam. He dealt frankly with the stubborn Communist rejection of all the approaches that have thus far been made to them. He stated—and I am in complete accord with this statement—that, despite the rebuffs we have suffered, we must be patient and persistent in our efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement.

All this is to the good.

But there are portions of the Senator's speech which, as I have already indicated, trouble me deeply because they appear to contradict the intent of the several passages to which I have already referred.

The Senator from Arkansas, for example, said that we encouraged President Diem "to violate certain provisions of the Geneva accords of 1954." And at a later point in this speech he urged a return to the Geneva accords, "not just in their essentials, but in all their specifications."

I have the distinct impression—and I believe the Senator from Arkansas will confirm this—that the portion of the Geneva agreement to which he was referring above all was that clause which called for the holding of free nationwide elections in 1956.

It is completely true that President Diem refused to go through with nationwide elections in 1956, and that we implicitly supported him in the stand he took.

But he refused to go through with these elections for the perfectly valid reason that the Communists had set up a totalitarian police state in the northern part of the country, that there had been no freedom of press or expression or political organization north of the 17th parallel since the control of the area was surrendered to Ho Chi Minh, and that the Communists had been guilty of basic violations of human freedom and of the spirit of the Geneva accord which made it senseless to talk about "free nationwide elections."

This is a point that cannot be emphasized too much.

By way of establishing the facts for the record, I want to quote from a column by Max Lerner in the New York Post on January 24, 1955, written after an interview with President Diem:

> Southern Vietnam will take part in the meeting to be held in June to discuss preparations for the 1956 elections.
>
> Southern Vietnam, since it protested the Geneva agreement when it was made, does not consider itself a party to that agreement, nor bound by it.
>
> In any event, the clauses providing for the 1956 elections are extremely vague. But at one point they are clear—in stipulating that the elections are to be free. Everything will now depend on how free elections are defined. The President said he would wait to see whether the conditions of freedom would exist in North Vietnam at the time scheduled for the elections. He asked what would be the good of an impartial counting of votes if the voting has been preceded in North Vietnam by a campaign of ruthless propaganda and terrorism on the part of a police state.

The scope and the degree of the totalitarian terror instituted by the Communist regime in North Vietnam from the day that it was established in 1954, can be documented from many sources. Among other things, they can be documented from the official Communist press itself.

Thus, General Vo Nguyen Giap, the North Vietnamese military commander and the military genius behind the Vietcong insurrection, made a statement, remarkable in its candor, to the 10th Congress of the Communist Party Central Committee in October 1956. Let me quote a few excerpts from General Giap's statement as it was printed in the official publication, Nhan Dan, on October 31, 1956:

> While carrying out their antifeudal task, our cadres have underestimated or, worse still, have denied all antiimperialist achievements, and have separated the land reform and the revolution. Worse of all, in some areas they have even made the two mutually exclusive.
>
> We have failed to realize the necessity of uniting with the middle-level peasants, and we should have concluded some form of alliance with the rich peasants, whom we treated in the same manner as the landlords.
>
> We attacked the landowning families indiscriminately, according no consideration to those who had served the revolution and to those families with sons in the army. We showed no indulgence toward landlords who participated in the resistance, treating their children in the same way as we treated the children of other landlords.
>
> We made too many deviations and executed too many honest people. We attacked on too large a front and, seeing enemies everywhere, resorted to terror, which became far too widespread.
>
> Whilst carrying out our land reform program we failed to respect the principles of freedom of faith and worship in many areas.

General Giap's admissions take on all the more significance when it is realized that the date on which he made the statement coincides roughly with the date of the "free nationwide elections" called for by the Geneva Convention.

I think—I hope—the Senator from Arkansas would agree that it makes no sense to talk about free nationwide elections in a country that has been cut in two when one portion of the country has been governed by a merciless dictatorial regime for several years.

I think he would agree that such an election could only be held if certain basic preconditions were met, including complete freedom of press and political organization, in both parts of the country, for a period of at least 1 year before the election; and also including a provision that the elections should be held under the auspices and control of some international body like the United Nations.

I hope he does not mean that Diem erred in not going through with the elections despite the political terror in the north, because it is clear as A B C that such an election could only have resulted in turning over the entire country to communism.

Let me point out here that at the Geneva Conference of 1954 the U.S. delegation at one point came out for free elections in North Vietnam under U.N. supervision, and that it was partly because of the rejection of this proposal that the United States decided against becoming a signatory to the Geneva accord.

In another portion of his statement the Senator from Arkansas said:

> It may be that the major lesson of this tragic conflict will be a new appreciation of the power of nationalism in southeast Asia and, indeed, in all of the world's emerging nations.

And he went on to say that "largely in consequences of our own errors, the nationalist movement in Vietnam became associated with and largely subordinate to the Communist movement."

To suggest, as this clearly does, that the Vietcong movement is a nationalist movement is to completely twist the the facts.

No one in Vietnam believes the charge that Americans have now come to their country in large numbers and are sacrificing their lives in its defense, because the U.S. plans to impose some kind of neocolonial regime on South Vietnam, for the purpose of exploiting its people and its resources.

On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of the people of South Vietnam look upon the Vietcong movement as an instrument of terror and oppression, seeking to subjugate them to the new imperialism of Peiping and Hanoi.

The true nationalists in South Vietnam are fighting on the side of the Government. They know that we have intervened at the request of the Government, and that our only purpose there is to help them defend their freedom against the antinationalist forces of the Vietcong.

But the portion of the Senator's speech which disturbed me the most was a paragraph which seemed to blur and confuse the truly fundamental moral differences between our side and the Vietcong, between freedom and communism.

I want to quote this paragraph to the Senate so that no one will be able to argue that I have pulled words or sentences out of context in my remarks:

A great nation—

Said the Senator—

is one which is capable of looking beyond its own view of the world, of recognizing that, however convinced it may be of the beneficence of its own role and aims, other nations may be equally persuaded of their benevolence and good intent. It is a mark of both greatness and maturity when a nation like the United States, without abandoning its convictions and commitments, is capable at the same time of acknowledging that there may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of its adversaries.

I am for seeking a negotiated settlement to the Vietnam war.

But I do not concede the Senator's contention that "there may be some merit and even good intent in the views and aims of our adversaries."

I consider communism to be one of the most totally evil regimes ever devised by man for the subjugation of his fellow man—a regime whose utter amorality and disregard for human life has perhaps only been equaled by the Nazi regime in Germany.

The Fascist regime in prewar Italy made the trains run on time. But I was never prepared to concede any merit or evidence of good intent to the Mussolini dictatorship because of this accomplishment.

Nor was I ever prepared to concede any merit or evidence of good intent to the Nazi regime in Germany because it succeeded in eliminating unemployment, building some working-class houses, and producing a prototype of the modern Volkswagon.

Despite their purely mechanical accomplishments, the Nazi and Fascist regimes were evil in terms of every meaningful criterion. They were evil because of their total denial of human freedom, because of their complete disregard for human life, and because they were committed from the outset to the course of aggression.

In the same way, I believe that communism, whether of the Soviet variety or the Chinese variety or any other variety, is evil by any meaningful criterion and that men of good will, once they have understood its nature, cannot remain morally neutral on the issue of Communist expansion.

I can see no merit in a regime which, whatever its mechanical or statistical accomplishments, has wiped out every vestige of human freedom, persecuted all religions alike, and sought to convert its subjects into brainwashed robots.

I can see no merit in a regime which has inflicted more suffering and cost more human life than all the wars of this century combined.

I can see no merit in a movement openly committed to the conquest of the world, which practices expansion through subversion, through stealth and through fraud, and through so-called "wars of national liberation."

I can see no merit in a regime whose terror has since the close of the war produced a flood of refugees—in Europe, in Asia and in the Americas—which by now must number some 15 million.

I can see no merit in a Vietcong movement organized and supported and directed by Hanoi and seeking to impose its dictatorship by means of a terror that has, since 1961, resulted in the assassination or kidnaping of more than 35,000 South Vietnamese civilians.

The refusal to recognize the fundamental moral differences between freedom and communism, this moral neutrality for lack of a better expression, is not a new phenomenon. It has existed in every decade since the Bolshevik Revolution, especially among the intellectuals and in the academic community.

Each generation has apparently been obliged to pass through its own period of illusion and disillusionment, of confusion and enlightenment. Thus, during the thirties, despite the Stalinist terror and the several millions who died during forced collectivization and the mass purge trials, some of the greatest writers and noblest spirits of our times were counted among the "friends of the Soviet Union."

One by one, they had to pass through their own private process of enlightenment, and the private ordeal of breaking with a thing in which they had believed profoundly.

To those who have forgotten the history of this period, I would recommend that they go back and read a dramatic book entitled "The God Who Failed," in which men of the stature of Arthur Kostler and Andre Gide and Ignazio Silone and Stephen Spender and many other prominent names in the world of letters, set forth the personal confessions of their experiences as "friends of the Soviet Union."

But perhaps the most eloquent and damning confession of all was written by a Jewish Lithuanian refugee, Dr. Julius Margolin, who had also regarded himself as a "friend of the Soviet Union"—until the Soviets occupied his country and deported scores of thousands of Lithuanians to slave labor camps in Siberia, and gave Dr. Margolin an opportunity to see the real Soviet Union—and not the phony Soviet Union that was shown to all the tourists who visited Moscow during the thirties and came away enraptured by what they saw and what they were told.

Dr. Margolin wrote:

Until the fall of 1939, I had assumed a position of benevolent neutrality toward the U.S.S.R. * * * The last 7 years have made me a convinced and ardent foe of the Soviet system. I hate this system with all the strength of my heart and all the power of my mind. Everything I have seen there has filled me with horror and disgust which will last until the end of my days. I feel that the struggle against this system of slavery, terrorism, and cruelty which prevails there constitutes the primary obligation of every man in the world. Tolerance or support of such an international shame is not permissible for people who are on this side of the Soviet border and who live under normal conditions. * * *

Millions of men are perishing in the camps of the Soviet Union. * * * Since they came into being, the Soviet camps have swallowed more people, have executed more victims, than all the other camps—Hitler's included—together; and this lethal engine continues to operate full blast.

And those who in reply only shrug their shoulders and try to dismiss the issue with vague and meaningless generalities, I consider moral abetters and accomplices of banditry.

These are cogent words. But, as the case of Dr. Margolin points up, the tragedy is that each new generation of intellectuals appears to be incapable of learning from the experience of the preceding generation. Each generation has its quota of party members and fellow travelers—and a much greater quota of moral neutralists who are not supporters of communism or even friends of the Soviet Union, but who simply believe that we must be openminded—both about the bad points in our own society and about the good points in Communist society.

So, while we seek a settlement in Vietnam, let us be under no illusions about the nature of the enemy or about the cost, in terms of human life and human suffering, as well as in terms of our own security, if we should fail to hold the line against Communist expansion in South Vietnam.

Let us seek an agreement that will put an end to the fighting. But let us avoid any agreement where our principles are so compromised and the free Vietnamese so weakened that a Communist takeover at an early date is bound to emerge. Above all, let us avoid the trap of coalition governments, which led to disasters in all of the central European countries.

Such a solution might provide us with a formula which saves face for us very briefly. But on the day that it is realized that the formula was no more than a face-saving device, and that it had led, as it was foreordained to do, to a Communist takeover in South Vietnam "the credibility of American guarantees to other countries, would have been destroyed as effectively as an unconditional withdrawal would destroy it; our obligation to help the Vietnamese people defend their freedom would be construed as a sham; and Peiping could not help but be convinced that its so-called wars of national liberation are a relatively safe and inexpensive way of expanding Communist power."

The Senator from Arkansas has said that the situation demands "major concessions from both sides." I do not know whether he was suggesting the possibility of a coalition government. I hope he was not. But certainly his words carry the implication that we are being too stiff necked, that we are demanding too much and offering too little.

I challenge such a contention.

President Johnson has made the American position crystal clear. We seek no further expansion of the war.

We seek no territories and no bases and no realm of colonial exploitation.

We seek only the acceptance of one condition—that Peiping and Hanoi call

off their aggression against the government and people of South Vietnam, that the fighting and killing stop, and that the South Vietnamese people be permitted to live their lives in peace and as they see fit.

In return, we have offered to include North Vietnam within the scope of the multi-billion-dollar Mekong River development program, with the untold benefits that it would bring to all the peoples of southeast Asia.

This, in my opinion, is a wise and reasonable posture.

Less than this we cannot ask for. More than this we cannot offer.

In closing, I again want to compliment the Senator from Arkansas on his forceful presentation of the case against complete withdrawal from Vietnam. Whatever criticism I may have made of certain parts of his statement which I considered unfortunate in their implications, I want to emphasize that we apparently see eye to eye, not only on the question of immediate withdrawal, but also on the need for continuing to seek a peaceful settlement of the war in Vietnam, despite the obdure which the Communists have thus far exhibited.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the debate in Congress on Vietnam which is beginning to heat up shows signs of being the type of constructive, intelligent criticism that I hope can be useful to the executive branch.

In view of the comments made yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], and a minute or so ago by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I should like to make the following six points:

First, in my judgment, we must negotiate with the Vietcong. We shall never get peace without doing so. The way to do it is to tell Hanoi that it can bring to the negotiating table anybody it wants to, and that we will talk with whomever they bring. This inevitably will include representatives of the Vietcong.

Second, I agree with the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] that we ought to look toward bringing the United Nations into the Vietnamese situation.

Third, the sooner we can get an international police force into Vietnam to maintain a cease fire and help to keep the peace, the better.

Fourth, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] that we should give serious consideration to returning to the 1954 Geneva accords and try to reinstate them.

Fifth, I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we cannot wait for Communist China. We must act without Communist China. She is not an enemy at the moment. Communist China has no military commitment in South Vietnam.

Sixth, the problem will not be solved by military measures. It will have to be done through diplomatic measures, hopefully with the aid of international institutions.

Having said that, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas that until we can bring the other side to the negotiating table, we shall have to stand fast on the ground. I do not want to escalate the war. I do no want to see the United States turn tail and run. I believe that a sound solution for the problem in Vietnam can be found.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a column entitled "Whom We Support," written by Walter Lippmann, and published in the Washington Post for today, June 17. I am in complete accord with the position taken by Mr. Lippmann.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, one further item in connection with Vietnam gives me deep concern. It is an article entitled "Saigon Orders Profiteers and Terrorists Executed," written by Seymour Topping, and published in the New York Times of June 17. The article states that the new leadership committee which is running the South Vietnamese Government, has stated:

> Vietcong terrorists, corrupt officials, speculators, and blackmarketeers would be shot without trial if there was tangible proof of guilt.
>
> In the central marketplace of Saigon, soldiers erected sandbag emplacements that would permit firing squads to carry out public executions with maximum publicity.

This is Fascist, this is Communist, this is totalitarian action. I hope that Ambassador Taylor and our State Department will lodge the strongest possible protest against this barbaric action by the South Vietnamese Government and will indicate that unless it is promptly changed, we will withdraw our support.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAIGON ORDERS PROFITEERS AND TERRORISTS EXECUTED

(By Seymour Topping)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, June 16.—The military rulers of South Vietnam imposed stringent measures on the population today to enforce discipline and curb war profiteering. Senior officers of the National Leadership Committee stated that Vietcong terrorists, corrupt officials, speculators, and blackmarketeers would be shot without trial if there was tangible proof of guilt.

In the central marketplace of Saigon, soldiers erected sandbag emplacements that would permit firing squads to carry out public executions with maximum publicity. Thousands of city residents and peasants in their conical hats milled about staring curiously at the sandbag walls.

As work progressed, a terrorist detonated a 10- to 20-pound explosive charge in the busy civilian passenger terminal at the Saigon Airport. A U.S. spokesman reported that 46 persons had been injured, including 34 American servicemen, but none seriously.

LABOR CAMP TO BE SET UP

Vietnamese officers said places of execution would also be set up in other centers of the country as reminders that the regime intended to act vigorously. A forced-labor camp for persons accused of lesser crimes against the state is also being opened, on Re Island, off the coast of Ruangngai Province.

The new measures reflect the feelings expressed by Maj. Gen. Nguyen Van Thieu, chairman of the 10-man leadership committee, which formally took power Monday, that a stern revolutionary regime is required to organize an effective national war effort against the Communists.

It was obvious that the measures were designed also to discourage political dissension or wavering if the military situation continues to deteriorate.

The militant Buddhist faction, small political groups in Saigon and students at Saigon University are already manifesting dissatisfaction with the restoration of military rule.

U.S. officals were uneasy about the tough line and by the reactions it might bring from volatile political factions.

TAYLOR CONFERS

Maxwell D. Taylor, the U.S. Ambassador, conferred at the Defense Ministry with General Thieu and Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, the Air Force commander, who has been designated by the leadership committee as the country's Commissioner General for Administration. The conference did not resolve the dispute over the committee's tentative nomination of Vice Marshal Ky as chairman of an executive council, a post that would make him, in effect, Premier in direct charge of the Government.

U.S. officials feel that the inexperienced 35-year-old officer would be a poor choice at this critical time.

The Buddhist faction, which would prefer a civilian executive council, is also blocking Vice Marshal Ky's appointment.

The Air Force commander stalked angrily out of the meeting with General Taylor and later, in conversation with friends, complained about the Ambassador's attitude.

Students at Saigon University have asked Vice Marshal Ky to speak at a meeting later this week to explain why it was necessary to reinstitute military rule after the resignation of the civilian Government of Premier Phan Huy Quat last Friday.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post, June 17, 1965]

WHOM WE SUPPORT

(By Walter Lippmann)

Whether we are dealing with Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, or with the foreign-aid program in general, there is one common problem which is crucial and central for all the many things we are undertaking. It is to find governments that we can support which are reasonably honest, efficient, and progressive, and are trusted by their own people.

We are learning in Vietnam how difficult it is to defend a country in which there is no government which can rally its own people. We are learning in the Dominican Republic what happens when there is no recognizable legitimate government to receive our military backing and our economic help.

The same difficulty is at the root of the disappointment, which is so great in this country today, at the results of the foreign-aid programs. We are, to be sure, much more vividly conscious of spectacular incidents like the burning of a library, than we are of the quiet successes. Nonetheless, there are disappointments, so many of them that the Senate has now voted another installment of foreign aid with the proviso that there is to be a radical reexamination of the whole policy within the next 2 years.

Without attempting to guess what conclusions will be reached in these 2 years, it is already quite evident that trouble arises when aid is funneled through corrupt, reac-

tionary, or highly incompetent governments. It is not easy to find enough good governments in all the emerging and underdeveloped countries, and, if we are philosophical about it, we must not be surprised at the difficulty of finding them. The condition is baffling, but that is a concomitant of inexperience and backwardness.

Moreover, American officials who have to administer the programs are frequently in a quandary. As a general rule the most impeccably anti-Communist governments are more often than not reactionary, stupid, and corrupt—as, for example, the Batista government in pre-Castro Cuba, or the Trujillo government in the Dominican Republic. On the other hand, the more progressively minded parties or factions include almost inevitably not only the left but the Communists on the left of the left. It takes a lot more acumen and political courage for an American official to back a progressive faction than it does for him to embrace a rightist faction. This dilemma confronts us continually in our role as champion of the free world in Asia, Latin America, and Africa.

Nevertheless, in the task of containing the expansion of communism there is no substitute for the building up of strong and viable states which command the respect of the mass of their people. The President, of course, knows this and has frequently said it. But the tragedy of our entanglement in Vietnam is that we find ourselves fighting what is in fact an American rear guard action to stave off the collapse and defeat of the Saigon government. In this cramped position, there is little opening or opportunity for us to use our power and our resources constructively in southeast Asia.

We may leave it to the historians to say how and why we are painted into a corner. Our task is to bring up our resources of power and wealth, which are intact, in order to cut down our unavoidable losses to the lowest possible cost in lives and in influence.

In our predicament it is a disservice, I think, to inflate and emotionalize the stakes in Vietnam, to make it appear that the whole future of America and of the western world in Asia and the Pacific is going to be fought out and decided in the Vietnamese jungle. It is not going to be decided there, and it is not going to be decided in any other single place. Thus, for example, we must prepare our minds even now for the possibility that Britain will not be able to carry much longer the whole burden of her responsibilities from Aden and the Persian Gulf through the Indian Ocean to Singapore. There looms ahead of us the prospect of having enormous new responsibilities thrust upon us, responsibilities which do not begin and will not end with our entanglement in Saigon.

That is why, though we cannot and must not scuttle and run, we must use our resources and our wits to avoid becoming bogged down in a large land war on the Asian mainland.

CHANGE OF TIME FOR CONSIDERATION OF DAUGHTERS OF AMERICAN REVOLUTION RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to change the time for the beginning of the debate on the Daughters of American Revolution resolution from 1 o'clock to 12:30. The debate will then run from 12:30 until 1 o'clock, with the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], or whomever he may designate, and the chairman of the Committee on Rules and Administration [Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I did not hear the complete statement by the majority leader. Is he now bringing up Senate Resolution 107?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; it will be taken up at 12:30 p.m.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the majority leader.

MANN CREEK FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, IDAHO

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 6032, to amend the act authorizing the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project. This is a companion bill to S. 1582, which passed the Senate yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that H.R. 6032 be laid before the Senate and move its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is discharged from the further consideration of H.R. 6032.

H.R. 6032 will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6032) to amend the act authorizing the Mann Creek Federal reclamation project, Idaho, in order to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for such project (act of August 16, 1962; 76 Stat. 388).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consider the bill.

The bill (H.R. 6032) was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which S. 1582 was passed yesterday be reconsidered and that S. 1582 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the vote by which S. 1582 was passed is reconsidered; and, without objection, S. 1582 is indefinitely postponed.

COMMENT ON STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator FULBRIGHT, spoke on Tuesday on the subject of Vietnam. His remarks constituted a most constructive contribution to the consideration of this critical issue and were in the best traditions of the Senate. With calmness and deliberativeness, he outlined the dimensions of the difficulties which exist in policy respecting Vietnam and the restoration of peace in that region. It will be, I am sure, of great help to the President and it is of great help to all of us in our understanding of this issue. The speech received very wide press coverage and editorial reaction, as it warranted.

I ask unanimous consent that several editorials commenting upon Senator FULBRIGHT'S statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 17, 1965]

A LIMITED OBJECTIVE IN VIETNAM

Decisions in crises determine the direction of nations more often that the philosophies of tranquil times. But a clear course set in advance is essential, nevertheless, in the kind of crisis that now seems to be looming in Vietnam.

The Vietcong's annual monsoon offensive, sheltered against American airpower by intermittent cloud cover, is straining the fiber of the South Vietnamese Army this year and is leading to a further buildup in American forces to over 70,000 men.

As the ground war intensifies, as American as well as Vietnamese casualties rise, there will be inexorable pressure on Washington this summer to throw American troops into the ground battle in increasing numbers, a step-up that under present unfortunate circumstances appears inevitable. Before this typhoon begins to whip about our ears and, while the possibility of orderly debate still exists, it is essential for the Nation to discuss its true ends and the means that should be employed to serve them.

Senator FULBRIGHT has taken this discussion forward to a new clarity after a long conversation with the President. His views should be read by every American—and we hope they will be read abroad as an authoritative statement. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee argues cogently against both "unconditional withdrawal" from Vietnam or an attempt, through escalation, to achieve complete military victory attainable "only at a cost far exceeding the requirements of our interest and our honor"—a cost that could rise to include ground combat with the North Vietnamese Army and even "massive Chinese military intervention * * * or general nuclear war."

The American aim this summer, in Senator FULBRIGHT'S view—a view which agrees closely with that often expounded on this page and over a period of many months—must be a "resolute but restrained" holding action. The hope is that the Communists will see the futility of trying to win military victory and will at length agree to a "negotiated settlement [necessarily] involving major concessions by both sides."

At a time when some military men and some Republican leaders, including Representative LAIRD, of Wisconsin, are returning to the Goldwater objective of total victory and calling for stepped-up bombing of North Vietnam, this restatement of aims is invaluable. The country and its allies abroad can only welcome Senator FULBRIGHT'S assurance that the President remains committed to ending the war at the earliest possible time by negotiations without preconditions. As we have previously noted here, there can be no such thing as military victory in Vietnam by either side, except at a cost so fearful it would not be worth the price—and even then would not be a victory in anything but name.

Yet the continued American troop buildup in South Vietnam, which shortly will triple the forces that were there in March, makes it vital for the President to speak out publicly himself. In recent months there has been a kind of ambiguity in administration policy that seems to have won the President as much support among Goldwaterites as within his own party. Only the President can lay this concern to rest.

The issue has been crystallized by Mr. LAIRD, who claims that the country will accept the troop buildup in South Vietnam and the casualties that lie ahead only if the objective is total victory, not if the outcome is a negotiated settlement. It is our conviction that Congressman LAIRD has misjudged the temper of the Nation as badly as Senator Goldwater did last fall.

The country will support the Vietnamese effort only as long as it remains convinced that it is a limited effort aimed at limited objectives. It will not accept unconditional withdrawal. But neither will it pursue the will o' the wisp of unconditional surrender. As Senator FULBRIGHT pointed out, "We must continue to offer the Communists a reasonable and attractive alternative to [a] military victory" that neither we nor they can win.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, June 17, 1965]

THE RIDDLE OF VIETNAM

Senator FULBRIGHT'S carefully worded address on American policy in South Vietnam, and Defense Secretary McNamara's announcement that about 20,000 more U.S. troops are being sent to that wartorn southeast Asian country, point up the enormity of the problems confronting the United States in trying to save the South Vietnamese from Communist conquest.

There is no easy solution to the puzzle, regardless of whether the emphasis in U.S. strategy is on negotiation or military action.

As Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, sees it, there is almost no likelihood of achieving a complete *and unconditional* military victory over the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam—not because the United States lacks the resources to achieve such a victory but because the tremendous cost in American lives and resources would be out of all proportion to whatever gains could be won by insisting on total and absolute capitulation by the enemy.

The Senator also believes—and gives equal emphasis to the point—that unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Vietnam would have disastrous consequences.

His conclusion is that neither total victory nor unconditional surrender is in prospect for either side in Vietnam and the war therefore must be ended, sooner or later, by negotiated settlement which will need to involve concessions of some kind by both sides.

There is much logic to Senator FULBRIGHT'S views. What he says, in his own fashion, is in line with what President Johnson has been trying to achieve for some time. The President has offered repeatedly to enter into negotiations without preconditions to achieve a settlement in Vietnam. He has extended to the Communists in North Vietnam an invitation to participate in a massive program of economic development aid.

Senator FULBRIGHT'S use of the word "concessions" will arouse alarm among many Americans and may have been an unfortunate choice in semantics. Perhaps "mutual agreements" or "two-way bargaining" or some such term would be more appropriate. Call it what you will, it is obviously necessary for successful negotiations to include a giving up of something by one side or the other in exchange for each gain won at the conference table.

There can be no hope of getting negotiations started, however, unless U.S. military forces in southeast Asia are maintained at sufficient strength to prevent Communist conquest of South Vietnam by force of arms. The immediate and urgent need is to stop the Red offensive and convince the enemy that it has no choice but to negotiate. It is in recognition of this need that more U.S. troops are being sent to Vietnam.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, June 17, 1965]

FULBRIGHT CONTRIBUTES

Senator FULBRIGHT does not know the answer for Vietnam, and unlike some other Members of the Senate and the House he does not pretend to. But Mr. FULBRIGHT is in the true sense a thinking man. When he speaks, after carefully marshaling his thoughts, he always contributes something to a dialog or a debate. He did so, after a long public silence on Vietnam, in a Senate speech on Tuesday.

The gist of the address was that in Senator FULBRIGHT'S opinion we must persist in our support of the South Vietamese Army, continuing our efforts to persuade the Communists that full military victory is unattainable; persist in our hope that such persuasion will lead to negotiation—despite the total absence so far of a sign on the other side of willingness to negotiate—and not escalate the war to the point of inviting such counter-escalation as might threaten general explosion, a point which he believes may be very close.

Mr. FULBRIGHT praised President Johnson for "steadfastness and statesmanship," and "patience and restraint," in resisting pressures to expand the war still more. This, along with his statement that we must not desert the South Vietnamese Army, serves as strong support of the President's fundamental position. All the more because the Senator speaks not for the administration but for himself, it helps the President in his resistance to those on the one hand who demand American withdrawal and those on the other who seem eager to expand the war further, regardless of the dangers.

As to solutions, Mr. FULBRIGHT proposed as a general proposition that the United States might offer to base a solution on the Geneva accords of 1954, which divided the old Indo-China, and which have not been strictly honored by anybody. This might be a way, and it might not. Mr. FULBRIGHT is trying to think of all the possibilities, and this particular speech at this particular time should help many others try to think, too.

THE PROPOSED MEXICO-UNITED STATES SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the purpose of S. 24 is to provide for expansion and acceleration of this Government's program of research and development in the field of salt water conversion. This bill, passed by the Senate yesterday, will extend the authority for the research through 1972, and appropriate an additional $200 million to carry on our activities in this promising area.

The existing program has progressed to a stage where it shows promise of converting salt water to fresh water at a rate which will be economically competitive.

The adequate supply of fresh water is not only a national problem, it is a worldwide problem. This has been pointed up acutely in recent years. Especially in our great Southwest is there an awareness of the magnitude of the problem. The threatened loss of supply has worked a distinct hardship not only in the States of our country, but also in Mexico, our friend and neighbor as well.

It is my sincere hope that acceleration of our desalinization research program will contribute to relieving the strain brought about by water shortages. I can think of no better way to apply modern technology to peaceful and humanitarian purposes.

I note that the Republic of Mexico either has in operation, or is considering the construction, of four desalting projects. One of them, a small pilot project on the Gulf of California, marks a mutual effort between the University of Arizona and the University of Sonora. It is my hope that the benefits of the research resulting from this bill, and those resulting from the projects of the Republic of Mexico, can be shared for the mutual benefit of mankind.

I make this statement on the basis of conversations, conferences, and recommendations made at La Paz, Baja California, during the fifth reunion of the Mexico-United States Parliamentary Group.

At that reunion, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and I made a suggestion that it might be a good idea to develop, on a cooperative basis, a Mexican-United States program in the desalinization of water. We know not only that it would be of great benefit to our own great Southwest, as well as other parts of the country, but also that, if a program of this nature could bring about a conversion of salt water to fresh water, and thereby irrigate more of our land and furnish more in the way of sustenance to our people, it would be a demonstration of real and needed friendship between our two great countries on a humanitarian basis.

Mr. President, I would hope, therefore, that the solid example set by our colleague, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] while he was Governor of Arizona, by means of which a cooperative water research project in the field of desalinization was undertaken between the University of Arizona and the University of Sonora, would be given proper attention by the appropriate agencies of our own Government—the Department of the Interior, the AEC, and others—to the end that we would be able to undertake, on an international, neighborly, friendly, and cooperative basis, mutual development in the field of desalinization.

This would be of extraordinary benefit to both our countries. It is the kind of program which I think should be given most serious consideration. I would hope that the administration would do what it could to further it.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished majority leader for the work that he has been carrying on with the people of the Republic of Mexico.

The junior Senator from Maryland observed that he noticed, on his trip to the conference at La Paz, the love and affection shown by the Mexican people toward our distinguished majority leader.

This program is of worldwide importance. The passage of S. 24 is of importance because it indicates to the world our desire to help others help themselves.

Not only can we participate with Mexico in their program to the great benefit of all mankind, but we also can participate in programs with countries of the Middle East, and many other countries of the world.

This is a program that is unselfish. It is a program that is being carried forward by leaders such as our distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

I am very proud to have the opportunity to give the Senator from Montana the recognition which he justly deserves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] and myself, that excerpts from the recommendations of the fifth meeting of the Mexican-United States Interparliamentary Group, covering this particular subject, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY GROUP—REPORT OF THE SENATE DELEGATION ON THE FIFTH MEETING, HELD AT LA PAZ, MEXICO, FEBRUARY 1965

DESALINIZATION

The discussion generated by the problem of salinity in the Colorado River led the members of both delegations to consider appropriate measures to deal with the growing shortage of fresh water not only in Mexico and the United States but in many parts of the world.

The U.S. delegation recommended intensified cooperative efforts between the Governments of Mexico and the United States to engage in joint research in the field of desalinization. The U.S. delegates referred to the pilot project already underway sponsored jointly by the University of Sonora and the University of Arizona.

Such joint research activities, followed by the development of plants capable of producing usable water at low cost, would save time and money for both countries. It would provide another example of constructive collaboration in mutual problems and encourage joint research in other areas of common interest.

While the U.S. delegation is not able to commit its Government, it is prepared to urge upon its executive branch that highest priority be given to this proposal.

PROPOSAL FOR A SLIDING SCALE SYSTEM OF SUPPORT PAYMENTS TO WOOLGROWERS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Argiculture and Forestry now has before it, in the new farm bill, a proposal from the Department of Agriculture for a sliding scale system of support payments to woolgrowers. This breaks with the system now in effect which provides for payments at a uniform level to all woolgrowers who are qualified, regardless of the size of their operation.

I strongly oppose the proposed new system of payments contained in the farm bill. The present system has worked well for 11 years and should be continued. Under the new proposal, payments per pound would be larger to the small producer than to the large producer. However, this would discriminate against the farmer or rancher who is wholly dependent on wool production for his livelihood, to the advantage of those who are only in the business on a part-time basis, and have other sources of income.

This was made very clear in an editorial appearing in the Wall Street Journal on Wednesday, June 16. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 16, 1965]

A WOOLLY PROPOSAL

If we recall aright, some of the political science textbooks used to say that one characteristic of a good law or regulation is that it applies equally to all. Whatever they say today, it is plain there have grown up some laws—on taxes and housing, for instance—which do not treat everybody alike.

The anomaly apparently doesn't bother very many people any more, so perhaps it is to be expected that a peculiar program providing for a sliding scale of Government support payments to woolgrowers, proposed by Agriculture Secretary Freeman, doesn't seem to disturb many people either, other than farmers and sheep ranchers.

Now the whole costly price support system as presently administered is dubious, but the wool proposal pushes the support theory over the brink of absurdity. For the administration plans to make lower support payments to larger woolgrowers and higher payments to smaller growers. Thus a grower who markets more than 7,000 pounds would be paid between 53 and 66 cents per pound; the smaller grower who markets up to 2,000 pounds would get between 62 to 74 cents.

Possibly smarting under all the criticism that farm schemes up to now have mainly aided big operators, the planners presumably want their new proposal to aid chiefly small producers. But as so often is the case, it would only produce a new inequity. The highest support payments would go to 200,000 growers who produce less than 2,000 pounds a season, raising sheep as a sideline and getting most of their income from other farm output. The lowest would go to about 5,000 growers, mostly in the West, who produce more than 7,000 pounds and depend almost wholly upon wool for their livelihood.

Just this sort of confusion is all too common when the Government seeks to impose its own economic theories on producers by one means or another. And it can be corrected only if all are treated alike, under the workings of a free market system. Otherwise, it's not only the sheep who will keep on getting fleeced.

TAX CREDITS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on June 3, 1965, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter and petition from the Student Council of Rutgers University.

I have received a letter from Mr. Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers University, stating that the university takes the position of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges opposing S. 12, my proposal for tax credits for higher education expenses, because they feel strongly that the bill involves an expenditure of an enormous sum of money to accomplish very little for education. Mr. Gross does not support this bill, there was no implication intended in my statement that he did, and I want the RECORD to show that he, as president of the university, is opposed to the bill.

EAST-WEST CENTER, HONOLULU, HAWAII

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, more and more, the story of the East-West Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, is being heard throughout this country and overseas. Created by the U.S. Congress in 1959, the record compiled by the Center in helping people and winning friends in Asia and the Pacific is an impressive one. Asian and Pacific students, medical technicians, teachers, government specialists, and professors have studied at the Center together with their counterparts from the mainland United States and have taken back to their homelands an image and appreciation of America which will last for a considerable period of time.

But the Center is more than an institution, more than a program, more than an assemblage of impressive buildings supported by the U.S. Congress. It also is the story of dedicated individuals and administrators.

The story of one of them, Dr. Y. Baron Goto, vice chancellor of the Center's Institute of Technical Interchange, has been interestingly told by Bill Hosokawa in the Pacific Citizen of June 11.

I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE FRYING PAN

(By Bill Hosokawa)

HONOLULU, HAWAII, SOUTH PACIFIC.—In a few weeks a friendly, balding man with the intriguing name of Y. Baron Goto will climb into an airplane and fly to Guam. There he will take another plane for Lae, a tiny dot of an island in the vast Pacific There he will attend the sixth conference of the South Pacific Commission, representing the Government of the United States at a six-nation meeting to discuss ways of improving the well-being of the people of Pacific island territories.

Goto is no stranger to the exotic lands of the South Pacific and southeast Asia. He has been a welcome visitor off and on the beaten paths of these areas for nigh onto 15 years as a foreign aid consultant, agricultural expert, and more lately as vice chancellor for the Institute of Technical Interchange at the East-West Center in Honolulu. The South Pacific Commission is just one of his incidental activities.

Dr. Goto—the title is honorary; he never had time enough to complete his doctoral studies—holds forth in a breeze-swept corner office at the East-West Center, an institution of international education established by the Government of the United States in cooperation with the University of Hawaii. But he is not in his element shuffling paper. He would much rather be moving about, talking, doing, working with people.

He likes to take visitors out on the balcony outside his office for a bird's-eye view of the Japanese garden that is his particular pride. It is a tangible product of the technical interchange program. When the Center was being built he persuaded some 20 Japanese business firms to contribute $77,000 for the garden. With the money he hired three Japanese garden experts. Then he brought in nine landscape architects—five Americans, and one each from the Philippines, New Zealand, Australia, and Thailand—to work and study with the Japanese, learning not only the techniques of building, but the spiritual and esthetic essence of Japanese gardens.

The 12 men, artists all, worked together for 2 months, produced the beautiful garden, and then returned to their respective homes

to share with others what they had learned. And what did the Japanese learn? The use of labor-saving machinery, such as portable cranes for moving heavy rocks, which enabled them to complete the work in one-third the expected time.

The Goto story—Baron Goto's father came to Hawaii before the turn of the century, returned to his native Fukuoka to marry. When Baron, whose Japanese name is Yasuo, was 7 months old, the Goto family moved back to plantation life in Hawaii. Thus Baron was technically an alien until he volunteered for military service in World War II and was given his citizenship.

On his first day in school the Caucasian teacher gave up trying to pronounce Yasuo, named him Baron after a Baron Goto who happened to have been newsworthy enough to be mentioned in the newspapers the previous day.

Goto, a plant pathologist and probably one of the world's leading experts on coffee growing, joined the Hawaiian agricultural extension service in 1928 and eventually headed the program. He was ticketed for the artillery in the war when wiser heads tapped him for the Japanese language school and military intelligence. He served in the Pentagon and after the surrender went to Japan with the strategic bombing survey.

Role for the Nisei: As American foreign aid consultant and adviser, Goto has traveled to Thailand, Laos, Indonesia, India, Pakistan, Nepal, New Guinea, Vietnam, Taiwan, and dozens of Pacific islands, showing people how to live better through better agricultural methods.

Goto is convinced that Nisei scientists and technicians can do a better job than American of European extraction in these areas for the simple reason that the Nisei look like Asians. There is no doubt that he is a shining example of what the Nisei can do for their country.

PISTOL CONTROL, PRINCE GEORGES COUNTY, MD.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on June 1, the Prince Georges County, Md., Commissioners gave final approval to a pistol control ordinance which requires a 5-day delay after application for the purchase of a gun and a police check of the application. That law, which became effective yesterday, is the first of this kind to be passed by a Maryland county.

The Washington Post recently printed an editorial congratulating the Prince Georges County Commissioners. I would like to add my voice to those who congratulate the commissioners and I would urge my colleagues to consider early and rapid passage of Federal gun law legislation.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAITING PERIOD

In an effort to protect the lives of people living in Prince Georges County, the county commissioners have unanimously adopted an ordinance requiring a 5-day "cooling-off period" before anyone may purchase a handgun. This delay in delivery of a lethal weapon will make it possible for the police effectively to enforce a prohibition on the sale of guns to minors under 21, to persons previously convicted of crimes of violence, to drunkards, or to persons who have been confined for mental illness within 3 years prior to the purchase. It will also make it possible for someone who buys a gun for the purpose of killing himself or others to reflect and reconsider.

This simple, sensible ordinance will, of course, be frenetically denounced by the gun lobbyists, as a similar proposal for the District of Columbia is currently being denounced. Yet State's Attorney Arthur A. Marshall, Jr., who deserves great credit for bringing about adoption of the ordinance, said no more than the precise, literal truth when he pointed out that "the gun ordinance will in no way impair the right of the average, honest, law-abiding citizen, who is not emotionally disturbed, from obtaining a weapon for his own personal protection or for the protection of his property, nor would it limit those gun enthusiasts and collectors from obtaining the necessary weapon nor would it restrict the sportsman or the huntsman from obtaining a weapon of his choice."

The Prince Georges County ordinance will not be fully effective, to be sure, in the absence of a statewide ban on the indiscriminate sale of firearms to any homicidal maniac, hopped-up punk, or professional criminal who may want to have a gun; and it will be in large part nullified until the Federal Government puts a stop to the senseless mail-order gun business. Nevertheless, it will save a few lives. And it will stand as an example and as a healthy expression of commonsense to the rest of the country. Prince Georges County is entitled to thanks as well as to congratulations.

SENATE BILL 107, TO INCLUDE THE LINCOLN BACK COUNTRY IN THE WILDERNESS SYSTEM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the May 1965 issue of the Defenders of Wildlife News, published by the Defenders of Wildlife, a national, nonprofit, educational organization, includes an article about a bill introduced by two Members of the Senate.

Under the heading "Conservationists Would Save Habitat of Endangered Species," the article deals with Senate bill 107, introduced by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] for himself and our distinguished majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD]. Their bill seeks to place the Lincoln back country in the wilderness system.

I commend this article to the attention of Senators, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSERVATIONISTS WOULD SAVE HABITAT OF ENDANGERED SPECIES

Montana conservationists are attempting to perpetuate several endangered or vanishing species of wildlife by supporting a movement to preserve the wilderness-type habitat the animals require for survival, the Montana Wildlife Federation recently reported.

The federation said one area involved is the 250,000-acre roadless Lincoln back country Scapegoat Mountain region southeast of the Bob Marshall Wilderness. The area includes parts of the Helena, Lolo, and Lewis and Clark National Forests. The Forest Service has announced plans for multiple-use development of the area, including logging, roading, and providing facilities for mass recreation.

Among the endangered or vanishing species which inhabit the area are the grizzly bear, bighorn sheep, bald eagle, grayling, and westslope cutthroat trout, the conservation organization stated.

The federation, in conjunction with the Montana Fish and Game Department and other conservation authorities, has recommended that the area be retained in a "trail-type" status.

Toward accomplishing this objective, Senator LEE METCALF, of Montana, introduced a bill, S. 107, in Congress January 6, 1965, to establish not to exceed 75,000 acres of the Lincoln back country as a wilderness area under the national wilderness preservation system. Senate Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD cosponsored the measure.

The Montana Wildlife Federation has indicated support of the Metcalf bill and has also urged that the zones around Scapegoat Mountain be given equal consideration for wilderness protection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

PRINTING AS SENATE DOCUMENT OF ANNUAL REPORT OF DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 107) authorizing the printing of the 67th annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 10 seconds.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the word *"Resolved"* and insert the following:

That the current annual reports of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the English Speaking Union, the Sons of Italy, the Scots Wha Hai with Wallace Bled Society, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, the International Order of Odd Fellows, the League of Women Voters, the American Association of University Women, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Girl Scouts of America, the Planned Parenthood-World Population Federation, the Americans for Democratic Action, the Ku Klux Klan, the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Association of Manufacturers, the United States Chamber of Commerce, the American Federation of Labor-Council of Industrial Organizations, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the John Birch Society shall all be printed at Government expense, regardless of length or content; and

Resolved, further, That there is authorized to be appropriated for the current fiscal year such sums as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12:30 having arrived, pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the time between 12:30 and 1 o'clock will be equally divided between the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Who yields time?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as necessary to speak on this resolution very briefly.

Senate Resolution 107, reported favorably by the Committee on Rules and Administration, on May 19, 1965, would authorize the printing of the 67th Annual Report of the Daughters of the American Revolution as a Senate document. The copies of such document would go primarily to the depository libraries in all parts of the United States.

As the report by the Committee on Rules and Administration to accompany Senate Resolution 107 points out, the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was incorporated by act of Congress on February 20, 1896, 29 Stat. 8–9, which act included the provision "that said society shall report annually to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution concerning its proceedings, and said Secretary shall communicate to Congress such portions thereof as he may deem of national interest and importance," but did not provide that such report be printed. When, in 1899, during the 55th Congress, the first report of the society was transmitted, as required by law, it was printed as a Senate document pursuant to a simple resolution agreed to by the Senate. All subsequent DAR reports, to date, have been printed as Senate documents under the same procedure.

In other words, in recommending approval of the present resolution, the Committee on Rules and Administration is following a practice of 66 years' standing.

I believe the DAR is unique among patriotic organizations incorporated by Congress since most of the others were chartered by statutes containing authority for the printing of their reports as public documents. The annual reports of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, for example, are printed automatically as House documents.

A great many people did not know that.

The same is true of the proceedings of the national encampments—required reports to Congress—of the national veterans' organizations. In this respect, might I point out that by Public Law 88–224, agreed to on December 21, 1963, the Congress added the AMVETS—American Veterans of World War II—to the list of such organizations whose annual reports shall be printed without any further action by the Congress. Those whose reports were already authorized to be printed are as follows:

Grand Army of the Republic.

United Spanish War Veterans.

Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

American Legion.

Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Veterans of World War of the United States of America, Inc.

The many contributions of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the historical, patriotic, and citizenship fields are well known and, I feel, acknowledged by even those Members of the Senate who have indicated they intend to oppose Senate Resolution 107. Consequently, I will not itemize those contributions, but I do ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point the 1964 DAR fact sheet of activities conducted by that organization.

There being no objection, the fact sheet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION FACT SHEET, 1964

The National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution was founded October 11, 1890, and incorporated by an act of the U.S. Congress in 1896. The national headquarters buildings in Washington cover an entire city block on beautiful 17th Street near the White House. The three adjoining structures—Memorial Continental Hall (1910), Constitution Hall (1929), and the administration building (1950), estimated total value $7 million—are the largest group of buildings in the world owned and maintained exclusively by women.

The president general and 11 cabinet officers, elected for 3-year terms, direct the business affairs of the society. Elected national officers, including 21 vice presidents general (7 elected at large annually for a 3-year term), meet at national headquarters six times a year—February, twice in April, June, October, and December. The annual meeting of the national society is the continental congress held in Washington during the week of April 19 (anniversary of Battle of Lexington) and attended by approximately 4,000 officers and delegates.

The membership of approximately 185,000 in nearly 3,000 chapters is distributed throughout 50 States and the District of Columbia, and includes overseas chapters in England, France, Puerto Rico, Mexico, the Canal Zone, and Cuba.

The society functions through 24 national and a number of special and standing committees to further its threefold objectives: historic preservation, promotion of education, and patriotic endeavor.

NATIONAL COMMITTEES, 24

I. Historical

To perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved American independence.

DAR Museum: Predominant Americana items number over 10,000 with 28 period rooms predating 1830. Open to the public.

Genealogical records: Purpose and valuable contribution: to secure and index unpublished genealogical material.

Lineage research: Created 1961: Free service to help potential members with application papers.

II. Education

To promote, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge.

American heritage: Created 1963: to aid and encourage the preservation of our rich American heritage in the fields of art, crafts, drama, literature, and music.

American Indians: Contributions and scholarships primarily to St. Mary's School for Indian Girls and to Bacone Indian College.

Children of the American Revolution: A national society of 18,000 boys and girls providing patriotic education and leadership of qualified youth in support, and appreciation, of American ideals.

DAR good citizens: Citizenship training: $1,000 national annual scholarship award to winning senior high school girl for outstanding dependability, service, leadership, and patriotism. State award, $100 bond.

DAR school: NSDAR owns two schools, Tamassee and Kate Duncan Smith; aids seven others. Contributes annually approximately $200,000; total to date approximates $5 million.

Junior American citizens: Excellent citizenship training program. Open to all boys and girls from kindergarten through high school.

Student loan and scholarship: Available through National, States, and chapters. In 1963, 500 students received over $475,000.

III. Patriotic

To cherish, maintain, and extend the institutions of American freedom: To foster true patriotism and love of country.

American music: Promotes American music through knowledge of American composers and encourages talented youth. Stresses American Music Week.

Americanism and DAR Manual for Citizenship: In 1913, the DAR founded the only Americanization School, in Washington, D.C. Has donated free over 9 million Manuals for Citizenship to immigrants.

Conservation: Authorized in 1909, stresses preservation of natural resources as an economic safeguard.

National defense: Basic purpose: Preservation of constitutional republic. Publishes documented material for information of members. Provides much free material upon request to students. Promotes observation of Constitution Week. Awarded 3,980 Good Citizenship Medals in 1963.

Flag of the United States of America: Teaches love and respect for, promotes knowledge and history of, our flag. Presents innumberable flags to youth organizations, playgrounds, and public buildings. In 1963, gave 35,000 flag codes and 50,000 flags, a gain of 24,000 flags over 1962.

IV. Administrative, executive, functional, organizational committees

DAR magazine: Official publication since 1892. Subscription (10 copies per year), $2.

Junior membership: Ages 18 through 35; in 1963, juniors numbered over 35 percent of the better than 7,500 members admitted and reinstated.

Program: Furthers NSDAR objectives: Promotion of education, historic preservation, and patriotic endeavor.

DAR magazine advertising: Many States and chapters advertise historic and educational shrines and locations.

Membership: Lifeblood of the NSDAR. In 1963, over 7,100 new and 650 reinstated.

Public relations: Tells the full DAR story. "Citizen, U.S.A.," a public service radio series, released February 1964.

Honor roll: Serves as a guide for chapter work.

Motion picture: Service committee; guide for youth entertainment.

Transportation: Traffic safety and promotion of historic pilgrimages.

V. Special committees

American History Month (February): Chapters overseas, Clearinghouse, Congressional.[1]

Constitutional Week (Sept. 17–23): DAR handbook, DAR school survey, Insignia.[1]

Museum special events, program reviewing, revision of bylaws.

VI. Standing committees

Auditing, buildings and grounds, finance, personnel, printing. Resolutions: Once adopted become the policy of the National Society.

[1] Celebration initiated by the DAR.

FOCUS ON ACTIVITIES

Of interest from the past

During the Spanish American War in 1898, the NSDAR established a hospital corps to recruit nurses for service; this became the nucleus of the Army Nurse Corps. Since then DAR members have contributed millions of dollars to patriotic activities: War bonds, Red Cross, war orphans, and the restoration of the waterworks of the destroyed French village Tillolov. National chapter and member endeavors in education have totaled nearly $5 million. The largest single undertaking was the Memorial Bell Tower at Valley Forge, Pa. Another outstanding project was erection of the Madonna of the Trail statues marking America's trek westward.

Current items, this administration, 1962

It would seem highly desirable to call attention to the following: The successful 1962–64 museum special event series; the improvement in the magazine format; the increase in the annual Good Citizens Award to $1,000; the gain in junior membership, in 1963 more than 35 percent of members admitted and reinstated; the NSDAR library expansion project, renovation of balcony section to afford greater reading area and accommodate the 50,000 books and pamphlets; the presentation of the flag of the United States of America at the 1964 World's Fair, on "DAR Day," April 25 in New York.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, it would appear that recent objections to printing the DAR reports as congressional documents were based primarily on the nature of certain resolutions which the organization adopted at its annual meeting. In all instances the organization expressed its sincere views on matters which it considered of vital concern to the Nation. Opposition to certain positions taken by the DAR would be a weak and undemocratic reason indeed to cancel a privilege enjoyed by many other organizations, which sometimes express pretty strong views themselves on a variety of subjects.

Mr. President, I urge that the Senate agree to the resolution.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield first to the proponent of the amendment?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am using my own time.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield himself time?

Mr. CLARK. No. My colleague from Pennsylvania supports the resolution. Therefore, why should I yield time to him?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I was asking if he wished to precede me.

Mr. CLARK. No.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this move to avoid printing a document involving about $2,500 is not what it appears to be on its face. What is actually involved here is an ideological and political activity which is masked as opposition to the printing of the DAR report for the 67th time. This report has been printed since 1889. It costs little or nothing.

Frankly, if the attempt to prevent printing is successful, I will introduce the entire report into the body of the RECORD, and the cost of printing 1,500 copies will not be very great, and the DAR will have its report.

What is really involved is a certain amount of activity outside the Congress on the part of far liberal leftwingers effort to mock some of the activities of the Daughters of the American Revolution, who, in turn, somewhat at times to my dismay, have heard speakers from the far right. While I do not agree with many of their choices of speakers—indeed, I am appalled by some of the doctrines espoused by some Americans who have served as speakers—I am even more appalled at the liberalism of the left which would seek to gag speakers who happen to agree with them on the other side.

While I do not agree with all they say, I am here to defend their right to say it, their right to be heard for the 67th time, their right to have their proceedings reported.

Let us understand that this is no move to save the country $2,500, because the move is generated by my friend and senior colleague, who has never been motivated to saving the country anything before now.

The move is, however, to enable those who wish at meetings of the far left to proceed in mockery of the distinguished ladies of the DAR, or the Un-American Activities Committee, or other right-wing speakers whom these deluded, in their opinion, ladies invite.

I do not like the views of some of the speakers any more than they do, but what I like less is the move generated from the far left to see that speakers who address the DAR are not allowed to have their reports circulated at the same time that every sort of document which the mind of a Senator or a Member of the other body can conceive of is printed in 25,000 to 50,000 copies and perpetrated on a thoroughly apathetic public who have no interest whatever in reading the habits of a cutworm, or a study involving the sex problems of watermelons—and there is such a document——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield on the Senator's time.

Mr. CLARK. I yield myself 15 seconds. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania appreciate what the pending amendment would do?

Mr. SCOTT. I realize indeed what the pending amendment is, and that is why I am so anxious to expose it. The Senator, by an argumentum ad ridiculuum proposes an amendment to print the reports of practically every organization in the country, hoping that by——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator is hoping that by such a snowfall of documents he will be able to perform a "snow job" on the report of the Rules Committee. I am against the Senator's motion to print the document of the John Birch Society, and to print the documents of other organizations, and that the reports be printed and incorporated under the laws of Congress, for the most part. It is not manifest to this Congress and was not considered by the Rules Committee. There is involved only $2,557 with which the Daughters of the American Revolution would like their report printed for the 67th time.

I do not believe that this move should be taken to keep these ladies from having their reports disseminated, merely because someone wishes to join in the general mockery of a patriotic organization. I would rather take my side along with the various patriotic organizations of this country, even though I believe that some of them do, at times, tolerate speeches of the kind of far conservatism which I myself do not accept. However, their right to be heard, and their right to continue printing, I believe, should be preserved.

Therefore, I oppose the amendment of my senior colleague, which I believe to be ill considered, ill advised, ridiculous, and otherwise not worthy of the consideration of the Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I contemplate following the recommendation of the committee on this resolution. I merely wish to point out the folly that sometimes seems to prevail and dominate the Senate in its consideration of certain measures which come before it.

Approximately 10 days ago, the Senate passed a $18.5 billion bill in 22½ minutes without any changes in the amount.

At the present moment, we have an item of $2,557 and the Senate is going to have a yea-and-nay vote upon it. I do not know how much time has already been spent in debate.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator will yield, what makes the Senator believe that I have asked for a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have only 1 minute to speak.

This is the finest example of the operation of the Parkinson Law—22½ minutes to spend $18.5 billion, and hours to get approval to spend $2,557.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield, on my own time, for a question?

What makes the Senator think that we are going to have a yea-and-nay vote?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have been told that there would be a yea-and-nay vote set for 1:30 p.m. It is ridiculous. We can-

not justify 100 Senators spending hours on this kind of item when, as I say, we spent 22½ minutes to pass an $18.5 billion bill 2 weeks ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield me a minute?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let me say to the Senator that the only agreement made was that the Senate would vote at 1 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. I have not the slightest intention of asking for a yea-and-nay vote. The Senator from Ohio is entirely in error in that regard.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It has been assigned a dignity and character never before given to any measure since I came to the Senate. A special notice was sent out that on this $2,577 item all Senators were notified that there would be a vote at 1:30. Never before has this happened in my 8 years in the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All this time is taken from the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I yielded myself 15 seconds, Mr. President, merely to ask the Senator from Ohio a question. He went on from there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has taken it out of the time of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The Chair puts that interpretation upon it as to who was yielding time.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President——

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Oregon require?

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Five minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on the subject before us, of the printing of the DAR report, I find it necessary to respond to the junior Senator from Pennsylvania, who made a great appeal that because the DAR report has been published at Government expense since 1889, we should not now refuse it.

I contend that we are not living in 1889, that many things we did then have been changed in the interim.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that we were trying to gag the DAR in publishing its report. We have no intention whatsoever of gagging them. They can go ahead and publish the report at their own expense. In fact, the DAR magazine spends $56,823 every year in publishing a monthly magazine. Consequently, they can well afford the additional $2,000 the Senate is now considering.

The point is not the money. The point is that this is giving the report the dignity of a Government imprimatur, which is a document we are all proud of, and which we are all delighted to have published with the great seal of the United States upon it.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of the report. I venture to say that Senators speaking in favor of the proposal have not read it as thoroughly as I have.

The first seven or eight pages are merely a repetition of each year's act of incorporation, and publicity for the present authors.

Inasmuch as I have been told, ever since I came to Congress, that this is a great patriotic document, I went through it completely to find out whether a schoolchild reading it would feel more impelled to be a loyal American citizen than he was before he read it.

What was patriotic about the document?

Let me pick it up at this point. I have made no notes, but will just pick out at random a few items, such as the report of the president general:

> In speaking of State conferences the president general would feel remiss if she did not pay a compliment to these outstanding, constructive meetings, and the inspiration and stimulation gained therefrom.

Mr. President, I continued to read, but found nothing to indicate what that inspiration and stimulation was.

The report of the first vice president general reads, in part:

> An enjoyable visit was made to the capital of Delaware to join the district daughters to make a historic tour of some of the fine old buildings.

Here is the report of the chaplain general:

> It was a pleasure to attend the session held by the DAR Museum Events Committee.

I am picking these items out at random, Mr. President. They are typical of the entire report. I went on and found that Douglas MacArthur was a great American so they sent him flowers during his last illness.

Finally, I thought that when I came to the treasurer general's report I would find that they were in dire circumstances, which was why the Government had to print the report.

Quite the opposite was the case as shown by a reading of the report of their income.

The report of the Registrar General states:

> Work has been progressing slowly on our microfilm project. Please label your contributions to this project very plainly "Registrar General microfilm fund."

The report of the historian general should have brought on——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oregon has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. The report states:

> To the continuing collection of the original signatures of our First Ladies, we are happy to add that of Lady Bird Johnson.

On and on and on in that vein goes the report.

It sounded to me much like the minutes of a meeting of my sorority, in which there is no more inspirational material than in what I have just read.

Now I come to the report of the individual States. Let me pick one out at random.

The report of the California State region states:

> Contributions to DAR schools amount to $4,983 in cash and $4,776 in clothing and gifts.

It continues on in similar vein. Here is the one on Massachusetts. I thought I had found some patriotic material, because they had an essay contest, which is a very noble thing for the DAR to sponsor, but nowhere are any of the essays printed to show why this was such a great contribution. I do not know what the Massachusetts children wrote their essays about, or what the DAR considered to be worthy.

In another place there were awards to good citizens, but what they had done to get the awards, I do not know.

This report is nothing more than the minutes of reports from various individuals in the DAR.

I try not to be destructive of the whole report; but I do find one item which I could commend.

That is the report of the conservation committee.

Mr. President, I do not deem this report worthy of Government printing.

Mr. CLARK. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The senior Senator from Pennsylvania has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when I first noticed that this matter was before us, I was somewhat amused. I recalled, when the new national headquarters building of the Daughters of the American Revolution was being constructed, but not quite completed, the president of that organization, a rather well compressed lady, addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution, who were gathered here in Washington, and said, "I am awe inspired by these girdles all around me." She was, of course, referring to the girders of the building. I was quite amused.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of what is proposed to be printed at Government expense. All this is proposed to be printed at Government expense, at a time when the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is complaining about the high cost of printing the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I find a reference here to the State of Ohio, which is perhaps similar to references relating to other States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Here is a report of the part that the Ohio Daughters of the American Revolution have oversubscribed their project to renovate "a first-floor bathroom in the all-States dormitory at Tamasee" and the "sealing of the walls of the Heaume Teacherage," and so forth.

These are fair examples from this huge bundle of papers that I hold in my hand. There is no reason why this should be printed at Government expense. It is true that the articles of incorporation of the DAR require that the society make an annual report to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution. The Secretary, in turn, is required to advise Congress of any portions of the report which may be of national interest or importance. There is absolutely no requirement that taxpayers' money be used to print the report.

There is a great deal of drivel here of no national interest or importance whatever. We have an opportunity to vote against it and save the taxpayers the $2,557 that is involved. It has been the custom in the past to approve the printing of the DAR report without question, perhaps because it involved only $2,000 or $3,000. This manifests a disregard for fiscal responsibility. In the DAR report which I have here, it is stated that "a sound dollar and fiscal responsibility are reasons for continued national security and freedom."

Mr. President, we should reject this resolution and let the Daughters of the American Revolution know that the U.S. Senate is just as interested in fiscal responsibility as they are.

The ultraconservative ladies who control this organization have consistently opposed most beneficent legislation for the welfare of the American people. However, they do not object to an unconscionable waste of taxpayers' money on the absolutely unnecessary printing of their own annual report.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an excerpt from the committee report.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the committee report (No. 200) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT

[To accompany S. Res. 107]

The Committee on Rules and Administration, having considered an original resolution (S. Res. 107) to print as a Senate document the 67th Annual Report of the Daughters of the American Revolution (Mar. 1, 1963–Mar. 1, 1964), report favorably thereon and recommend that the resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

To print as a Senate document (1,500 copies) $2,557

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the resolutions of the 74th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 74TH CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION, APRIL 19–23, 1965

REDEDICATION

Whereas for 75 years the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution has developed spiritual strength and grown in membership dedicated to the goal of the preservation of the republican form of government under the Constitution of the United States which guarantees to every citizen opportunity, justice, and freedom; and

Whereas through the society's educational, patriotic, and historical programs, a deeper love of country, and loyalty to its fundamental principles, and appreciation of American citizenship have been inculcated upon the hearts of thousands of children and adults:

Resolved, That, in this diamond jubilee year, the members of the Daughters of the American Revolution rededicate themselves to hold fast to those traditions and principles which have made this Nation great and, with steadfastness of purpose and undying faith in a free America under God, forge new links in the chain of our national strength with each generation.

PRESIDENTIAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

Whereas a strong belief in the divine providence of God and reliance upon His Power and will, invoked in prayer, inspired and sustained the founders in their effort to establish this "Nation under God"; and

Whereas the Presidential prayer breakfast held annually in Washington was inaugurated by leaders of the groups in the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States who meet weekly for prayer breakfasts:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express to the President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, as the leading participant in the annual Presidential prayer breakfast, to the leaders of the groups in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and to the Members of the Congress of the United States who meet weekly for prayer breakfasts, appreciation for this example of belief in the importance of spiritual values in the guidance of those upon whom rest the decisions for government of this great "one Nation under God."

AMERICAN HISTORY—TEXTBOOKS—PATRIOTIC EDUCATION

Whereas education is one of the principal objectives of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; and

Whereas it is the duty of every citizen to know the principles upon which this Nation was founded: freedom, equality, justice, and humanity; a democracy in a republic; a government of the people, by the people, and for the people; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has said that the battlefield for the minds of men may well be staged in the classrooms of the Nation; and

Whereas it is the responsibility of the adult population to concern itself with the education of youth and to screen the textbooks and pamphlets from which these children are taught; and

Whereas the preparation and the attitude of the teacher are essential factors in the educational system;

Resolved, That the members of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, show such interest in the textbooks, pamphlets, visual aids, and other source material used in the classrooms as to be certain that there is, in the manner of presentation, a positive approach to stimulating a feeling of patriotism for our country;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge that the principles of the Founding Fathers and the political processes of our Government be reemphasized in all levels of education and be made a requisite in the preparation for the teaching profession.

LAW AND ORDER

Whereas during the past decade the United States has experienced an alarming increase in lawlessness of all kinds, especially crimes of violence against innocent and defenseless citizens; and

Whereas disrespect for authority and law enforcement is shown by the increase of assaults on police who, with rare exceptions, perform their duties courageously, effectively, and with disregard for their own safety; and

Whereas the maintenance of law and order is the most basic duty of Government; and

Whereas this alarming prevalence of crime is undermining values which Americans hold dear and which our Constitution and the Government were designed to protect and preserve; and

Whereas this situation can be and will be rectified only when an aroused citizenry determines to take action necessary to bring about a restoration of law and order;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, call upon all loyal and patriotic Americans to extend support and gratitude to law enforcement officers in their efforts to maintain law and order, and to pledge their unyielding efforts to restore domestic peace, that once again the people of the United States may enjoy the blessing of living in a society governed by just laws, enacted and interpreted in accordance with the Constitution, and which are impartially administered.

DISPLAY OF STATE FLAGS

Whereas the 10th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people"; and

Whereas the stars of the flag of the United States of America are symbols of the sovereignty of the 50 States; and

Whereas the State flags are a reminder of the status of individual States as separate, sovereign powers vested in the people; and

Whereas as stated by the Supreme Court, the preservation of the States and the maintenance of their governments are as much within the design and care of the Constitution as the preservation of the Union and the maintenance of the Federal Government:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge the members of the State societies to encourage State and local governments, as well as private individuals and organizations, to display State flags with the flag of the United States of America to symbolize, not only the sovereignty of the States, but also the vital role of each in the Union of the States within a Republic.

SUPPORT STRENGTHENING OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Whereas the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, has consistently supported the Immigration and Nationality Act and the national origins quota principle and has conducted an effective program of aid to aliens seeking to become citizens, has published and distributed since 1921 more than 9 million free copies of a Manual for Citizenship, presented Americanism medals to adult naturalized citizens who have demonstrated outstanding qualities of leadership, trustworthiness, service, and patriotism; and

Whereas there have been 10 major amendments of the Immigration and Nationality Act over a 12-year period and the public record shows that approximately 300,000 immigrants have been admitted annually during the past decade, with only one-third of those admitted coming in under established quotas and the remaining two-thirds entering either as nonquota immigrants or through emergency legislation which bypassed the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas new liberalizing proposals would again greatly increase numbers of immigrants to be assimilated into our culture, inevitably increase unemployment and place

an additional burden on our costly public welfare programs; and

Whereas liberalizing proposals include the establishment of an Executive appointed Immigration Board which would have delegated authority (properly the exclusive prerogative of Congress) which would override the present Joint Congressional Committee on Immigration and Nationality Policy as authorized under present law:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, continue to support a strengthened Immigration and Nationality Act and national origins quota principle with continued control of a selective immigration policy by Congress which will serve first our national self-interest as do the immigration laws of all other nations.

THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Whereas the Constitution of the United States of America provides for the election of the President and Vice President by a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which each State is entitled and directs that the electors shall make distinct lists of all persons voted for as President and Vice President, and the number of votes for each; and

Whereas since 1832, the majority of States has presented to the voters a predetermined bloc of electors, resulting in the present unit rule, which deprives the minority in every State of representation in the final electoral tally, actually adds the minority vote in each State to the majority vote of that State, concentrates power in the larger States, and has resulted in gross inequities, depriving the people of their sovereign rights; and

Whereas it is already within the power of the several States to abolish the inherent inequities of unit rule by providing for the election of electors in each congressional district, with the two electors representing its U.S. Senators elected at large; and

Whereas any constitutional amendment which would abolish the electoral college while continuing the unit rule for the total electoral vote to which each State is entitled would perpetuate and write into the Constitution inequities never contemplated by its authors:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, support the electoral college as a vital check and balance in the Constitution of the United States of America, urge its membership to seek an end to unit rule for the electoral vote in each State and the substitution of voting for electors by districts, in conformity with the original practice under the Constitution.

DISARMAMENT

Whereas the preamble of the test ban treaty, ratified and signed by the United States of America, declares that the principal aim of the contracting parties is "the speediest possible achievement of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international controls," which program could result only in world government with subsequent loss of sovereignty and the freedoms secured by the Constitution; and

Whereas despite the war in Vietnam, and the fact that there is no evidence that the Communists have abandoned their goal of world dominion, this Nation recently authorized funds for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency thereby persisting in its drive toward disarmament; and

Whereas the United States appears to have embarked on a program of unilateral disarmament including cutbacks of foreign bases, phasing out of the manned bomber program, and cancellation of production of new weapons systems, thereby weakening American security:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge a strong military posture capable of defending this Nation from all enemies, and warn that complete and general disarmament can result only in a socialistic one world government.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE MONETARY SYSTEM

Whereas national solvency is essential to continued American freedom, and the preservation of the free world economy hinges on the soundness of the dollar which has declined in value by more than 50 percent over a 30-year period; and

Whereas almost continuous deficit spending by the Federal Government has undermined faith abroad in the dollar and forced the United States to remove the gold reserves previously held as backing for Federal Reserve deposits in order to make this gold available for foreign claims, which are the result of persistent U.S. deficits in the international balance of payments; and

Whereas the United States is endeavoring to stem the flow of gold, without acknowledging that the root of its trouble is excessive Federal spending:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express firm conviction that the fiscal solvency of the Nation can be assured only by balanced budgets, curtailed foreign spending, and maintenance of adequate gold reserves behind the currency.

LEGISLATIVE REAPPORTIONMENT

Whereas article IV, section 4, of the Constitution of United States of America provides, in part, "The United States shall guarantee every State in the Nation a republican form of government"; and

Whereas the reapportionment directive to the State legislatures requires that they be composed of representatives elected on the principle of one man, one vote without respect for previously regarded characteristics stemming from each State's distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage, thus eliminating the previous system of checks and balances; and

Whereas the reapportionment directive allows large cities to exercise excessive power while agricultural, rural, and small town regions would be without their constitutional right of adequate representation:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge that appropriate effort be made to continue the historic precedent of checks and balances in State legislatures established by the Constitution of the United States of America in order to protect the sovereign rights of the States and of the people therein.

UNITED NATIONS GENOCIDE CONVENTION

Whereas article VI, section 2, of the Constitution of the United States of America provides that "all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; * * * anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding"; and

Whereas, despite varying pressures over a 15-year period, the Senate of the United States has refused to ratify the U.N. Genocide Convention (treaty), which fails in its primary purpose of preventing genocide among nations, does not include persecution of political groups in its definition of "genocide" and, by its terms, permits totalitarian countries to sign the convention with impunity; and

Whereas contrary to general opinion, the United Nations Genocide Convention is directed toward individuals rather than nations and opens a new concept of international law whereby domestic crimes would be converted to international crimes by treaty law; and

Whereas the convention offers a threat to a free people since it does not define what constitutes "causing serious mental harm to a group," for which crime American citizens would be exposed to possible arrest, extradition and trial before an "international penal tribunal" without benefit of rights secured by the Constitution:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the Senate of the United States for its wisdom and restraint in thus far refusing to ratify the United Nations Genocide Convention, and express the hope that the Senate will steadfastly continue to protect the American people from the dangers of treaty law.

COMBATING COMMUNISM AND COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA

Whereas subversive propaganda is disseminated by segments of the communications media, and by misguided persons as well as active Communists and sympathizers; and

Whereas special targets of the Communists are youth, religious, and minority groups; and

Whereas authoritative information on the tactics, methods, semantics, and objectives of world communism is essential to understanding and combating its false propaganda:

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, urge its members to study available reliable information on Communist techniques and objectives, including official Government reports of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and other material exposing the Communist conspiracy, in order to be alert to its insidious plans and influences:

Resolved, That the National Society Daughters of the American Revolution, urge its members to work for the enforcement of the Internal Security Act of 1950, which was designed to provide greater protection for our Nation and our citizens against Communists and Communist organizations.

REGULATION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE

Whereas article I, section 8, paragraph 3 of the Constitution of the United States of America defining powers of Congress states, "The Congress shall have power to regulate foreign commerce, * * *"; and

Whereas the constitutional responsibility of Congress to regulate our foreign trade was surrendered in 1934 to the executive branch of Government through the Trade Agreements Act, with authority to transfer such responsibility to an international agency composed and competitive foreign nations sitting in Geneva, Switzerland; and

Whereas since 1947, the international agency known as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which was never approved by Congress and in which the United States has but one vote, has been regulating our foreign commerce; and

Whereas present low tariffs have adversely affected numerous American industries with consequent loss of jobs of American workers;

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, reiterate its previous support of the constitutional principle that regulation of foreign commerce rests with the Congress of the United States of America.

APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, assembled for the 74th continental congress, acknowledge the message from President Lyndon B. Johnson with much appreciation and thanks.

APPRECIATION TO MRS. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere thanks and appreciation to Mrs.

Lyndon B. Johnson for the thoughtful invitation to the White House during the 74th continental congress and for her gracious hospitality which made the visit memorable.

APPRECIATION TO THE SPEAKERS

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express warm appreciation to the speakers, Mr. Frank Taylor, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Dr. Howard Mitchell, Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, and the Honorable Albertis S. Harrison, Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, for their timely messages that were a source of inspiration and valuable information.

MUSICIANS

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere appreciation to the artists whose musical talents enhanced the pleasure of the congress and to the U.S. Service Bands for their stirring music.

THANKS AND APPRECIATION TO NEWS MEDIA

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express sincere appreciation to all news media in the Washington area for the excellent reporting of the 74th DAR Continental Congress with especial thanks to the Washington Post and the Evening Star for the outstanding color features and comprehensive coverage.

APPRECIATION TO THE STAFF

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express grateful appreciation to the entire personnel of the staff for their faithful and loyal service in every department of the organization.

COURTESY RESOLUTION

Resolved, That the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, express gratitude to:

The pages for their untiring service.

The large number of individual members who planned and contributed to the success of the 74th continental congress.

The policemen and firemen for their attention to all matters pertaining to our protection and safety.

APPRECIATION TO THE PRESIDENT GENERAL

Resolved, That we, the Daughters of the American Revolution, in this 74th continental congress assembled, express to Mrs. Robert V. H. Duncan, president general, our deep appreciation for her untiring work and effort for the betterment of our society; our admiration for the efficient and gracious manner in which she conducted this congress, and for her kindliness and consideration of others at all times.

APPRECIATION TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE

Resolved, That the members of the 74th continental congress, Daughters of the American Revolution, express their deep and sincere appreciation to Mrs. Elizabeth M. Cox for her faithful and considerate leadership and for her excellent work in fulfilling the exacting and difficult duties as chairman of the resolutions committee.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a list of the corporations chartered by special act of Congress be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATIONS CHARTERED BY SPECIAL ACT OF CONGRESS

Agricultural Hall of Fame.
U.S. Agricultural Society.
Association for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.
Archaeological Institute of America.

ARTS AND SCIENCES

(See also Education)

Academy of Music of Washington, D.C.
American Academy in Rome.
American Academy of Arts and Letters.
The American National Theater and Academy.
American Symphony Orchestra League.
Columbian Institute for the Promotion of Arts and Sciences.
Trustees of the Corcoran Gallery of Art.
National Academy of Art.
National Academy of Sciences.
National Committee on Radiation Protection and Measurements.
National Conservatory of Music of America.
The National Gallery and School of Arts.
The National Institute for the Promotion of Science.
National Institute of Arts and Letters.
National Music Council.
Smithsonian Institution.

BANKS

Bank of Columbia.
Central Bank of Georgetown & Washington.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Farmers' & Mechanics' Bank of Georgetown.
Farmers' Bank of Alexandria.
Franklin Bank of Alexandria.
Freedman's Savings & Trust Co.
Joint Stock Co. of the Young Men's Christian Association.
Mechanics' Bank of Alexandria.
National Safe Deposit Co. of Washington.
National Safe Deposit, Savings & Trust Co. of the District of Columbia.
National Savings Bank of the District of Columbia.
Patriotic Bank of Washington.
President and directors of the Bank of the Metropolis.
President and directors of the Bank of Washington.
President and directors of the Union Bank of Georgetown.
President, director and company of the Bank of Alexandria.
President, directors and company of the Bank of Potomac.
President, directors and company of the Bank of the United States.
Second Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Union Bank of Alexandria.
Washington City Savings Bank.

BENEVOLENT, CHARITABLE, ETC., ASSOCIATIONS

(See also Fraternal orders orphanages)

Agricultural Hall of Fame.
Aviation Hall of Fame.
Benevolent Christian Association of Washington City.
Big Brothers of America.
Board of Children's Guardians (for the District of Columbia).
Colored Catholic Male Benevolent Society.
Colored Union Benevolent Association.
Eastern Star Home of the District of Columbia.
Edes Home.
Ellen Wilson Memorial Homes.
German Benevolent Society.
Guardian Society.
Home for the Relief of Friendless Women and Children.
Howard Institute and Home.
Louise Home, Trustees of the.
Masonic and Eastern Star Home of the District of Columbia.
Metropolitan Police Relief Association of the District of Columbia.
National Association for the Relief of Destitute Colored Women and Children.
National Florence Crittenton Mission.
Near East Relief.
News-boys' Home of Washington City.
Provident Association of Clerks.
Washington City Benevolent Society.
Washington Temperance Society of Washington City and the District of Columbia.
Young Men's Christian Association of the city of Washington.
Young Woman's Christian Home, trustees of.

BRIDGES

(See also Roads)

Arkansas-Mississippi Bridge Commission.
Cairo Bridge Commission.
City of Clinton Bridge Commission.
City of Dubuque Bridge Commission.
Louisiana-Vicksburg Bridge Commission.
Memphis and Arkansas Bridge Commission.
Muscatine Bridge Commission.
Navy Bridge Co.
Niagara Falls Bridge Commission.
North River Bridge Co.
Owensboro Bridge Commission.
Port Arthur Bridge Commission.
Sabine Lake Bridge and Causeway Authority.
Washington Bridge Co.
White County Bridge Commission.

BUSINESS ENTERPRISES, GENERALLY

(See District of Columbia and United States)

Canals

Alexandria Canal Co.
Inland & Seaboard Coasting Co. of the District of Columbia.
Lake Erie & Ohio River Ship Canal Co.
Maritime Canal Co. of Nicaragua.
National Bolivian Navigation Co.
Potomac Ferry Co.
Washington & Boston Steamship Co.
Washington Canal Co.
Washington Mail Steamboat Co.

Cemeteries

Glenwood Cemetery in the District of Columbia.
Mount Olivet Cemetery Co.
Oak Hill Cemetery Co.
Prospect Hill Cemetery, in the District of Columbia.
National Child Labor Committee.
National Conference on Citizenship.

CLUBS

(See also Fraternal orders)

Boys Scouts of America.
Boys' Clubs of America.
Congressional Club.
Future Farmers of America.
General Federation of Women's Clubs.
Girl Scouts of the United States of America.
Colleges: See Educational institutions.
Cooperatives: See Banks.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Citizens' Building Co. of Washington City.
Georgetown Gaslight Co.
Georgetown Water Co.
Metropolitan Mining & Manufacturing Co. of the District of Columbia.
Pioneer Manufacturing Co. of Georgetown, District of Columbia.
Union Gas-Light Co. of the District of Columbia.
Washington, Alexandria, & George Town Steam Packet Co.
Washington Gas Light Co.
Washington Sanitary Housing Co.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA: GOVERNMENT

Girls' Reform School of the District of Columbia.
Mayor, alderman and Common Council of the City of Washington.
Mayor and Council of the City of Washington.
Mayor, Board of Aldermen, and Board of Common Council, of the City of Washington.
Redevelopment Land Agency.
Unemployment Compensation Board.

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

American Chemical Society.
American Social Science Association.
American University.
Board for Fundamental Education.
Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
Carnegie Institute of Washington.
Catholic University of America.
Columbia Institution for the Deaf.
Columbia Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb, and the Blind.
Columbian College in the District of Columbia.
Columbis University of Washington, District of Columbia.
Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf.
Gallaudet College.
General Education Board (of the District of Columbia).
George Washington University.
Georgetown College.
Georgetown Lancaster School Society.
Gonzaga College.
Howard Institution of the City of Washington.
Howard University.
Institution for the Education of Colored Youth.
Mechanic Relief Society of Alexandria.
National Education Association of the United States.
National Fund for Medical Education.
National Institute of Social Sciences.
National University.
Southeastern University.
Trinity College of Washington, District of Columbia.
Washington College of Law, Washington, D.C.
National Fair Association of the District of Columbia.
National Fair Grounds Association.
Society of American Florists and Ornamental Horticulturists.

FRATERNAL ORDERS

American Cross of Honor.
Hungarian Reformed Federation of America.
Great Council of the United States of the Improved Order of Red Men.
Grand Lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows of the District of Columbia.
The Imperial Palace, Dramatic Order of Knights of Khorassan.
Knights of Pythias.
Trustees of the Grand Encampment of Knights Templar.
Masonic Hall Association of the District of Columbia.
Masonic Temple Association of the District of Columbia.
Supreme Council (Mother Council of the World) of the Inspectors General Knights Commanders of the House of the Temple of Solomon of the Thirty-Third Degree of the Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite of Free Masonry of the Southern Jurisdiction of the United States of America.
Freehold Land and Emigration Co.
The National German-American Alliance of the United States of America.

HISTORICAL AND LITERARY ASSOCIATIONS

American Historical Association.
Columbia Library of Capitol Hill, in the City of Washington.
Columbia's Library for Young Men.
Columbian Library Company in Georgetown.
East Washington Library Association.
Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association.
National Trust for Historic Preservation in the United States.
Naval History Society.
St. Thomas' Literary Society.
Washington Library Company.

HOSPITALS

American Hospital in Paris.
Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum.
Directors of the General Hospital of the District of Columbia.
Providence Hospital.
Washington General Hospital and Asylum of the District of Columbia.

HOTELS

Capital Hotel Co.
Continental Hotel Co.
National Hotel Co., in the City of Washington, in the District of Columbia.
Inebriate Asylum of the District of Columbia.

INSURANCE

Acacia Mutual Life.
Columbian Insurance Co. of Alaxandria.
Fire Insurance Co. of Alexandria.
President and Directors of the Firemen's Insurance Co. of Washington and Georgetown.
Franklin Insurance Co.
Masonic Mutual Life Association of the District of Columbia.
Masonic Mutual Relief Association of the District of Columbia.
Mutual Fire Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia.
Mutual Investment Fire Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia.
Mutual Protection Fire Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia.
National Capitol Insurance Co.
National Life Assurance & Trust Association.
National Life Insurance Co. of the United States of America.
National Union Insurance Co. of Washington.
Potomac Fire Insurance Co. of Georgtown.
Potomac Insurance Co. of the District of Columbia.
Potomac Insurance Co. of Georgetown.
Washington Insurance Co.

LEGAL SOCIETIES

American Society of International Law.
Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.
Market Co., Washington.

MEDICAL ASSOCIATIONS

(See also Hosiptals)

Eclectic Medical Society of the District of Columbia.
Group Hospitalization, Inc.
Medical Society of the District of Columbia.
Association of Military Surgeons of the United States.
Post Graduate School of Medicine of the District of Columbia.
Washington Homeopathic Medical Society.

MEMORIALS AND CELEBRATIONS

Belleau Wood Memorial Association.
Centennial Board of Finance.
Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, Inc.
George Washington Bicentennial, District of Columbia Commission.
Lincoln Monument Association.
Luther Statue Association.
McKinley Birthplace Memorial Association.
Roosevelt (Theodore) Memorial Association.
United States International Commission (for the New York Exposition in 1883).
Washington National Monument Society.
Women's Theodore Roosevelt Memorial Association.

MILITARY GROUPS

(See also Veterans)

Army and Navy Legion of Valor of the United States of America, Inc.
Marine Corps League.
Military Chaplains Association of the United States of America.
Naval Sea Cadet Corps.
Navy Club of the United States of America.
Reserve Officers Association of the United States.
Music: See arts and sciences.
Newspaper: Evening Star Newspaper Co. of Washington.
American Numismatic Association.

ORPHANAGES

(See also Benevolent, charitable, etc., associations)

Female Orphan Asylum of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia.
Georgetown Free School and Orphan Asylum.
German Orphan Asylum Association of the District of Columbia.
German Orphan Home of the District of Columbia.
National Soldiers' and Sailors' Orphan Home.
St. Ann's Infant Asylum.
Saint Joseph's Home and School.
St. Joseph's Male Orphan Asylum.
Saint Vincent's Home and School.
Saint Vincent's Orphan Asylum.
Washington City Orphan Asylum.
Washington Home for Foundlings.
Washington Hospital for Foundlings.
Washington's Manual Labor School and Male Orphan Asylum Society of the District of Columbia.

PATRIOTIC ORGANIZATIONS

(See also Veterans)

American War Mothers.
Blue Star Mothers of America.
Civil Air Patrol.
National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.
Daughters of Eighteen Hundred and Twelve, National Society of United States.
Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic.
National Women's Relief Corps, auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic.
National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

RAILROADS

Anacostia & Potomac River Railway Co. of Washington City, District of Columbia.
Anacostia & Potomac River Railway Co.
Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Co.
Belt Railway Co.
Brightwood Railway Co. of the District of Columbia.
Capital Railway Co.
Capital Traction Co.
Capital Transit Co.
Capitol, North O Street & South Washington Railway Co.
Choctaw, Oklahoma & Gulf Railroad Co.
City & Suburban Railway of Washington.
Columbia Railway Co.
Connecticut Avenue & Park Railway Co.
District of Columbia Suburban Railway Co.
East Washington Heights Traction Railroad Co. of the District of Columbia.
Eckington & Soldiers Home Railway Co. of the District of Columbia.
Georgetown & Tennallytown Railroad Co. of the District of Columbia.
Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator & Railway Co.
Maryland & Washington Railway Co.
Metropolitan Railroad Co.
National Junction Railway Co.
Northern Pacific Railroad Co.
Panama Railroad Co.
Rock Creek Railway Co. of the District of Columbia.
Texas & Pacific Railway Co.
Texas Pacific Railroad Co.
Union Pacific Railroad Co.
Utah & Northern Railway Co.
Washington & Arlington Railway Co. of the District of Columbia.
Washington & Georgetown Railroad Co.
Washington & Great Falls Electric Railway Co.
Washington & University Railway Co. of the District of Columbia.

Washington & Western Maryland Railroad Co.
Washington County Horse Railroad Co.
Washington Railway & Electric Co.
The American National Red Cross.

RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance of Unitarian Women.
Association of Universalist Women.
First Congregational Society of Washington.
Congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Washington.
King Theological Hall.
Lucy Webb Hays National Training School for Deaconesses and Missionaries.
Trustees of the Presbyterian Congregation, in Georgetown.
Protestant Episcopal Cathedral Foundation of the District of Columbia.
Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the Diocese of Washington.
Roman Catholic archbishop of Washington (Patrick A. O'Boyle).
Brotherhood of St. Andrew.
Sisters of Charity of St. Joseph.
Sisters of Mercy in the District of Columbia.
Sisters of the Visitation.
Sisters of the Visitation of Washington.
International Sunday School Association.
National Theological Institute and University.
Union Church of the Canal Zone.

ROADS

Alexandria & Leesburg Turnpike Co.
Columbia Turnpike Roads, president, director and company of.
Georgetown & Alexandria Turnpike Road.
Georgetown & Leesburg Turnpike Co.
Washington & Alexandria Turnpike Co.
National Safety Council.
Schools: See Educational institutions.

SPORTS

Little League Baseball, Inc.
United States Olympic Association [Committee].
Washington Target-shooting Association.
Conference of State Societies, Washington, D.C.
Steamship companies: See Canals.
Street railways: See Railroads.
Telegraph Company, Loomis Aerial.
Transportation facilities: See Bridges, canals, railroads, roads.

U.S. AGENCIES

(NOTE: Under this heading are organizations chartered for purposes of carrying out a variety of different functions of the Government.)
Central Bank for Cooperatives.
Commodity Credit Corporation.
Communications Satellite Corporation.
Cordova Bay Harbor Improvement and Town-Site Co.
Corporation of Foreign Security Holders.
Disaster Loan Corporation.
Electric Home and Farm Authority.
Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Farmers' Home Corporation.
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.
Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.
Federal National Mortgage Association.
Federal Prison Industries.
Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation.
Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation.
Home Owners' Loan Corporation.
Inland Waterways Corporation.
Institute of Inter-American Affairs.
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.
Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.
Second Export-Import Bank of Washington.
Smaller War Plants Corporation.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
Textile Foundation.
U.S. Housing Authority.
U.S. Shipping Board (Emergency) Merchant Fleet Corporation.
Virgin Islands Corporation.
War Finance Corporation.

VETERANS

(See also military groups)

American Legion.
AMVETS.
Blinded Veterans Association, Inc.
Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America.
Disabled American Veterans (of the World War).
Grand Army of the Republic.
Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A., National Memorial, Inc.
Military Order of the Purple Heart of the United States of America.
National Asylum for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.
National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.
National Military and Naval Asylum for the Relief of the Totally Disabled Officers and Men of the Volunteer Forces of the United States.
National Yeomen F.
Society of the Army of Santiago de Cuba.
Soldiers' and Sailors' Union of the City of Washington, D.C.
Sons of Union Veterans of the Civil War.
United Spanish War Veterans (of the District of Columbia).
United States Blind Veterans of the World War.
Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc.
Zoological Society, Washington.

Mr. CLARK. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution is a fine, patriotic organization. I am sure that we all are aware of it and that the entire country is aware of it also. I know it personally from attending one of their conventions and hearing a highly patriotic and moving speech by Dan Smoot. I should like to ask the Senator from Pennsylvania if any other national organizations have their annual reports printed and paid for by the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. CLARK. There are a few, but very few. The Senator from North Carolina has already put the list in the RECORD. There are perhaps a half dozen. However, there are about 300 federally chartered corporations which do not have their annual reports so printed.

Mr. BARTLETT. I did not know that any other organizations had their reports printed by the Government. I can think of fine organizations in Alaska that make annual reports of some kind. The Pioneers of Alaska, and the Alaska Native Brotherhood are composed of fine and upstanding Indians and Eskimos.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I modify my amendment to include the organizations mentioned by the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. BARTLETT. There is also the Alaska Native Sisterhood.

Mr. CLARK. I ask that that organization also be added to my amendment, and that it be modified in that respect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator modifies his amendment accordingly.

Mr. BARTLETT. I am not so sure that these organizations should be added, because they are able to pay for the printing expense involved in connection with the publishing of their annual reports, even though they may be federally chartered. However, I cannot understand where all this originated. I do not believe the taxpayers should be under obligation to meet this expense.

Mr. CLARK. If the Senator from North Carolina is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, I am prepared to do likewise.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am not prepared to yield back the remainder of my time. I yield 2 minutes of my time to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield briefly?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the resolution.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I cannot escape the conclusion that the opposition to the pending proposal is no more than a poorly veiled frontal assault on the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution. It seems obvious that the attack stems from the very strong and commendable positions taken by the society on the many vital issues that confront our country today. The opposition to printing the 67th annual report of the society certainly cannot be based on the cost involved. The sum, estimated by the Public Printer at $2,557, is virtually infinitesimal by every standard used in the Senate. On many occasions legislation authorizing the expenditure of millions, or even billions, is passed by the Senate with hardly a second thought.

The National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution was incorporated by act of Congress in 1896, and since the 55th Congress, it has been customary to print their annual report as a Senate document. Although this is not authorized by law, many other noteworthy items are printed as Senate documents from time to time, in the same manner—pursuant to a Senate resolution.

The Daughters of the American Revolution are often subjected to unjust abuse from some segments of the press and from some other quarters. This abuse, which occasionally borders upon outright vilification, takes the form of personal attacks upon both the leaders and members of the society, and upon the positions reflected by resolutions adopted at their meetings. I have many friends among the members of the society and have been privileged to attend their meetings. I know of no finer group in America today.

The 74th Continental Congress of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution met in Washington in April of this year. During this meeting they passed 13 resolutions, which it has been my pleasure to have printed in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and appropriately referred. Mr. President, I know of no more dedicated or patriotic organization in this country than the DAR, as is exemplified in these 13 resolutions. During the past 75 years, the DAR has been in the forefront of efforts in this country to promote educational, patriotic, and historical programs. These efforts have been designed to foster a strong sense of dedication in our country to the great and immutable principles of Government which have made our Nation the greatest the world has ever known.

In my judgment, the DAR does not need defending. I am happy, nevertheless, to support the pending resolution to print as a Senate document their 67th annual report, as has been recommended by the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, there are some comic overtones to this situation. I am under no illusion as to what the patriotic Members of the Senate are about to do with respect to both my amendment and the proposal to spend $2,500 to print this quite ridiculous report.

I have nothing further to say, but I do hope that someday, somehow, we will stop this nonsense. If I have any time remaining, I yield it back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from Pennsylvania (putting the question).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Daughters of the American Revolution is one of the very finest organizations in this country.

To detail even in cursory fashion its many accomplishments in behalf of the country would take far, far more time than we have here today under the consent agreement.

The fact is, the accomplishments have been many, and will no doubt continue into the future. I support wholeheartedly Senate Resolution 107, authorizing the printing of the 67th Annual Report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

I ask unanimous consent that a brief origin and history of the National Society of the DAR, prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the origin was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORIGIN OF THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

When the news was telegraphed to various papers, on April 30, 1890, that the Sons of the American Revolution—at a general meeting in Louisville, Ky.—voted to exclude women from membership in their organization, much indignation was aroused among the latter and discussions began immediately as to the founding of a separate society for themselves. On the very next day, May 1, 1890, Miss Eugenia Washington, a great grandniece of General Washington, proposed the plan to Mrs. Flora Adams Darling, who heartily approved but thought that, inasmuch as many of those supposed to be eligible were out of town for the summer, action should be deferred until September. On July 13 Mrs. Mary Lockwood, a member of the press association in Washington, published in the Washington Post a reproduction of the history of Hannah Arnett, the Revolutionary heroine, and concluded with this interrogation: "Where will the Sons and Daughters of the Revolution place Hannah Arnett?" Whereupon, on July 21, William O. McDowell, a great-great-grandson of Hannah Arnett, and one of the Sons of the American Revolution, published in the same newspaper an article in response, concluding with a formal call for the organization of a National Society for the Daughters of the American Revolution.

There were several meetings during the summer and much correspondence on the subject. On October 11, 1890, a formal assembly was held at the Strathmore Arms, 810 12th Street, Washington, D.C. The gathering was an enthusiastic one, and 18 women expressed the wish to become members. It was determined that the society should be national, with headquarters in Washington where their congress would convene yearly in February, and that the head of the new organization should be a woman of national repute. A constitution was provisionally adopted and officers elected—Mrs. Caroline Scott Harrison, wife of the President of the United States, being chosen president-general.

On October 18, 1890, the dark blue and white of Washington's staff were chosen for the society's colors and "amor patriae" selected for the society's motto. On December 11, 1890, the motto was changed to "home and country." A seal representing a woman seated at a spinning wheel was first chosen but is now modified to a golden spinning wheel with distaff of silver. The latter design was patented by Dr. G. Brown Goode, September 22, 1891, and transferred to the society.

On March 20, 1891, the first chapter was formed in Chicago. In April of the same year the office of State regent was created. The meetings of the national organization were held during the first year at the home of Mrs. Mary Virginia Ellet Cabell but later, in various public halls in the city that were large enough to accommodate the ever-increasing membership. At first there was an advisory board of gentlemen—all Sons of the American Revolution—but all advisory boards elected since 1894 have been made up entirely of women. When the continental congress convened in 1895, there were 44 State regents, 145 chapter regents, 33 delegates on the credential list in addition to the national officers, and a membership of 8,198. On December 2, 1895, the organization was incorporated by act of Congress under the name of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have the opportunity of suggesting a brief quorum call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to Senate Resolution 107. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 64, nays 9, as follows:

[No. 142 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Aiken	Cotton	Kuchel
Allott	Curtis	Lausche
Anderson	Dirksen	Long, La.
Bass	Dodd	Magnuson
Bayh	Ellender	Mansfield
Bennett	Ervin	McCarthy
Bible	Fannin	McClellan
Boggs	Harris	McGovern
Brewster	Hart	Mondale
Burdick	Hartke	Monroney
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Morton
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Murphy
Cannon	Inouye	Pastore
Carlson	Jackson	Pearson
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Randolph

Ribicoff	Sparkman	Williams, N.J.
Robertson	Stennis	Williams, Del.
Russell, S.C.	Symington	Yarborough
Scott	Thurmond	Young, N. Dak.
Simpson	Tower	
Smith	Tydings	

NAYS—9

Bartlett	McGee	Neuberger
Clark	Moss	Proxmire
Douglas	Nelson	Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—27

Church	Hill	Montoya
Dominick	Javits	Morse
Eastland	Kennedy, Mass.	Mundt
Fong	Kennedy, N.Y.	Muskie
Fulbright	Long, Mo.	Prouty
Gore	McIntyre	Russell, Ga.
Gruening	McNamara	Saltonstall
Hayden	Metcalf	Smathers
Hickenlooper	Miller	Talmadge

So the resolution (S. Res. 107) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the sixty-seventh annual report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution for the year ended March 1, 1964, be printed, with an illustration, as a Senate document.

AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT TO APPOINT GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE (U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED), TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 264, H.R. 7777.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Avation Agency.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader and myself, that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of having an informal meeting with Colonels McDivitt and White, and paying our respects and appreciation for what they have accomplished.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.)

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the proceedings during the recess were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"GEMINI 4" PROGRAM—VISIT TO THE SENATE BY LT. COL. AND MRS. JAMES A. McDIVITT, LT. COL. AND MRS. EDWARD H. WHITE, AND MR. AND MRS. CHARLES W. MATHEWS

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is an informal session—the best kind. May I, on behalf of the U.S. Senate, and the people of the Nation, extend a very hearty welcome to Colonel McDivitt, to Colonel White, and to Mr. Mathews, who was the mission director of this great operation of Gemini 4; to Mrs. White, to Mrs. Mathews, and to Mrs. McDivitt. This is a wonderful team that we have here. I know all of you are going to want to meet them, and say hello to them personally and privately. But I just thought that, since we were in the Senate, and this is the forum for speechmaking, it might not be a bad idea if we would hear a word or two from the two astronauts and possibly from the mission director.

I take the privilege of presenting to this august body and to the occupants of the gallery, one and all, the man who was in charge of the space capsule and who was the man who kept it in proper orbit when one of them stepped out and left him—Colonel McDivitt. [Applause.]

Colonel McDIVITT. Mr. Vice President and Senators: I suppose there have been many words spoken in this room. [Laughter.] As a matter of fact, I spoke a few myself in the last couple of days.

I just do not know what to say to a distinguished body like this, except one thing: I am very proud to be an American today. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thank you, Colonel McDivitt.

I think you would all like to know that as we were riding down the streets here today, people were shouting at him, "Hurrah for Michigan and Illinois."

He claims at least two or three States.

We had a wonderful time in Chicago, where he was born, and where he has a host of friends.

We also have with us a gentleman from Texas and also from Washington, D.C. That is Colonel White. He attended the schools of the District of Columbia. He is the son of General White. This man needs no introduction from me except to say that to be in his presence is a joy second to none. Colonel White. [Applause.]

Colonel WHITE. Mr. Vice President, Senators, leaders of our country, and friends: It is indeed a very great honor to be here today. As we came into Washington, we were concerned about the weather. We were told that it might rain a little. But the weather was controlled pretty well. Someone told us, as we rode down Pennsylvania Avenue, that it was raining. I think the warmth of the people dried it all up; I did not feel a drop. [Laughter.]

I am here representing a very great team who made the flight of Gemini 4 possible. I think really what I felt during the last few days was that Jim and I had the very great privilege of representing the people of America in the places we have gone, and the feelings that have been conveyed to us have been so warm that they are difficult to describe.

Again, it is a great honor to be here. Thank you very much. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. I am sure that our two distinguished astronauts would be the first to say, as they have said many times in recent days, that their success was not due only to their own proficiency, skill, faith, and training. These men are fine family men, men of deep faith and conviction. I personally believe they represent the living embodiment of the harmony between faith and science. These men have said repeatedly that their success was due to a team—the team of the American people, Government, industry, science, labor, university people—one and all—Defense, NASA, Congress. I think that they would tell you, as they have before, that the success of their flight was due to the men in charge of the operation of Gemini 3 and Gemini 4, Grissom and Young, McDivitt and White.

I am happy to present a gentleman who was born in Duluth, Minn. He went from there to other places of equal fame.

I present Mr. Charles Mathews, Program and Operational Director for Gemini 4. [Applause.]

Mr. MATHEWS. Ladies and gentlemen: Yes, I was born in Minnesota. Now I reside in Texas. That ought to put me in fairly good shape. [Laughter.]

Truly, a team effort was involved. I represent the team. I am continuously amazed with the ability of the various elements of the program. It is spread countrywide and represents many echelons of our country. It is a marvel to observe how well this group works together. When we get into operations, during the development phases of the program, it is difficult to tell a NASA man from a Department of Defense man or a McDonnell man or a Martin man. I am deeply appreciative of how well this group has welded itself together to perform the excellent operations we have had.

On the other hand, we cannot go forward with the program without the encouragement of the many. I greatly appreciate the encouragement and support that has been given the program by Members of Congress. I thank you sincerely for it. We could not get along without it. Thank you. [Applause.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now we want to have a word from the ladies. May I first present Mrs. Pat McDivitt, the mother of Mike, Patrick, and Anne—three wonderful children. [Applause.]

May I next present Mrs. Pat White, the mother of Bonnie and Edward, both of whom, together with the three McDivitt children, as well, have been at the White House today, where they received an invitation from the President to spend the evening at the White House, go to the movies, go into the swimming pool—get the whole works. [Laughter and applause.]

Now I present Mrs. Charles Mathews, the mother of Douglas and Betty Anne, who likewise were at the White House today. [Applause.]

Betty Anne told me, "I am so excited. I never believed it could ever happen to me." So you know how they feel.

Now, if every one of you wonderful people will come down here and be greeted, I know that everyone would like to say hello. I believe that would be the best way to do it. Would you like to do it?

The distinguished visitors were greeted by the Members of the Senate.

At the conclusion of the ceremonies, the Vice President escorted the guests of honor from the Chamber.

At 1:50 p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair).

RECEIPT OF MESSAGES AND SIGNING OF BILLS DURING ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House containing duly enrolled bills and that the Vice President, President pro tempore, or the Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign such bills during the adjournment of the Senate until Monday June 21, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENT OF GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired), to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], who is unavoidably absent this afternoon.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR DOMINICK

I shall not oppose the enactment of S. 1900, nor certainly shall I oppose the appointment of Gen. William F. McKee (USAF, retired) to the Office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

As far as I have been able to determine, General McKee is a very capable administrator and, of course, he had an outstanding military career. I want to make it clear that my reservations concerning the enactment of this legislation are in no way intended to cast any doubt on General McKee's capabilities, integrity, or character. However, I do feel that a piecemeal approach such as S. 1900 is the wrong way to deal with this matter.

We find ourselves in this dilemma because the Federal Aviation Act requires that the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency shall be a civilian at the time of his nomination. Of course, General McKee could resign his commission and comply with this requirement. However, he has built up substantial entitlement to military retirement pay and such a move would mean that he would have to forfeit this.

I am sure that Congress was aware of such a situation when it wrote in the requirement in the Federal Aviation Act that the Administrator shall be a civilian.

I would much prefer that we deal with this problem on a broad, general basis either by reconsidering the policy written into the Federal Aviation Act or in taking care of such a situation by revising the Dual Compensation Act. To deal with this kind of a situation on a case-by-case basis causes unnecessary embarrassment to the individuals involved and has the effect of reversing clear policy enunciated by Congress. I should hope that in the future we might give consideration to this kind of approach which would certainly seem to me to be more desirable than wrestling with the very difficult problems posed by S. 1900.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Texas.

INTRODUCING A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR COMPENSATION TO PERSONS INJURED BY CERTAIN CRIMINAL ACTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these days we can hardly pick up our newspapers without seeing that somewhere in our great land an innocent, law-abiding citizen has been brutally attacked on our streets, a woman or girl raped, or the sole support and wage earner in a family murdered. It was only last Friday—June 11—when we read in the Washington Post that a little boy was intercepted on his way to school, stabbed in the throat, strangled, wrapped in burlap, and left dead in a laundry bag. Earlier this year we were all shocked to read that a Member of the other body, Representative JAMES CLEVELAND, of New Hampshire, was attacked right outside his own home here in Washington. Such incidents as these happen almost daily here in Washington alone, and it is beyond the capacity of our overworked police to stop them. This is a shocking and sad situation and I know that all Members of this body join me in this sentiment.

It is even more shocking and sad when we realize that the innocent victims of these crimes are in no way compensated for the injuries which they receive. It is the victim who must pay for the medical treatment which he must receive. With the present high cost of medical and hospital care, this may run into many hundreds or even thousands of dollars, even in those cases where the victim has medical insurance. It is the survivors of a murdered wage earner who must face years of financial hardship and even poverty. It is the assaulted or raped girl or child who must bear perhaps years of physical pain and mental anguish without any compensation to alleviate the pain. In fact, in this country today we have the peculiar situation that a worker who is disabled while on the job may receive thousands of dollars of compensation even though his negligence in part contributed to the injury, while the same wage earner if disabled from a criminal attack for which he bore no responsibility whatsoever must face a future without any compensation at all. That such a situation should exist in this, the richest nation in the world, I find deplorable.

I am introducing a bill today which is aimed at correcting this situation. It is explicitly drafted to compensate the victims of crimes of violence for injuries to the person, not for loss of property. It provides only for the cases in which the injured person was in no way responsible for the injury—the innocent victim of crime. It is not the purpose of this bill to compensate every participant in a street brawl or a gang war. Furthermore, the bill I am introducing today will provide only for minimal costs of the injuries received. In receiving compensation, the victim could not end up being better off than he otherwise would have been.

Compensation by the State to the victims of violent crimes is admittedly a concept new to American law, but it is not a concept new to other common law countries. In 1963 the Parliament of New Zealand enacted such a plan and last year the Parliament of Great Britian, after a very thoughtful debate, put a similar plan into operation. In both countries these plans are now operating successfully. In our own country, there has also been recent discussion of compensating the victims of crimes of violence. On July 2 of last year—1964—in an address before the Texas Association of Plaintiffs' Attorneys in Houston, I suggested such a plan. My advocacy of such a plan is pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 12, page 16390. And the eminent Mr. Justice Arthur Goldberg has been another advocate for the establishment of such a program. Today, I introduce a bill to effectuate these ideas.

The reason that responsible persons in New Zealand, Great Britain, and this country have felt the need for such a plan follows logically from developments that have been occurring in our law and in our society. Since the middle of the 19th century, we have turned away from the old concepts of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth and every man his best protector as workable methods for punishing criminals and protecting the law-abiding citizen. We have demanded that people no longer go armed on our streets in order to protect themselves. We have outlawed vigilante groups. We have left the punishment of the criminal to the State rather than to the victim's relatives or a lynch-crazed mob.

We have told our people that they will be best protected if law enforcement is left to the Government, not to the private person. Having encouraged our people to go out into the streets unprotected, we cannot deny that this puts a special obligation upon us to see that these people are, in fact, protected from the consequences of crime. As Mr. Justice Goldberg pointed out in his James Madison lecture at the New York University School of Law, the victim of a crime of violence "has been denied the protection of the laws in a very real sense, and society should assume some responsibility for making him whole." I think it is time that we in the Congress start considering the creation of a plan that will accomplish this goal. That is why I am introducing this bill today, the provisions of which are based on the best aspects of the plans already in operation in New Zealand and Great Britain. Yet, at the same time, they are suited to and based on American law and American experience.

I am proposing to create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission. This would be a three-man tribunal. The Chairman and the two other members, chosen because of their legal experience and expertise, are to be appointed for 8-year staggered terms by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commission will consider the claims of those injured by criminal violence. It will be the Commission's job to examine the evidence presented to it both to determine what level of compensation should be granted and whether, in fact, the person making the claim was truly an innocent victim. In setting the compensation, the Commission will provide only for actual losses incurred by the victim or, in the case of murder, his dependents. The amount of compensation that can be awarded will be limited, so that it could not exceed $25,000 in any case. The determination of the Commission is to be considered final; there will be no right of appeal. A victim of a crime of violence in order to receive compensation must submit his request within 2 years after the injury occurred.

The bill applies only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power. These are the District of Columbia and the special maritime and territorial jurisdictions of the United States.

It is here that rape, murder, and assault are Federal crimes. This territory includes, besides the District of Columbia, American ships on the high seas and international waters, lands reserved or acquired for the use of the United States and under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government—including forts, dockyards, and arsenals of our Armed Forces—and American aircraft over the high seas or international waters. In other words, this bill will not in any way extend the plan to territories outside the direct jurisdiction of the Federal Government. It will in no way impinge on the rights of the several States, but I would hope that Federal action of this nature would encourage States to adopt similar plans in the several States. This would not in any way impinge on the civil tort law of any State.

Mr. President, we who live in Washington are all too familiar with the brutal beatings, murders, rapes, and assaults which take place in our great cities. I have heard many speeches given on the floor of this Senate deploring that such a situation should exist, yet still the innocent victims of these crimes go about uncompensated. It is true enough that monetary compensation is very little compensation to a widowed mother or an assaulted child, but a compensation which would at least fairly meet the medical bills and some of the financial loss which these innocent victims of violent crimes have suffered is infinitely better than the absolute neglect and indifference they are now receiving.

When a violent crime against the person is committed on one of our streets, a murder, a rape, or an assault, our society puts the broken bleeding body in an ambulance, and, if still alive, takes them to an emergency ward in a hospital, and leaves them to their own resources, keeping an interest in them only as a possible witness in a criminal prosecution against the offender. What happens to the perpetrator of the brutal attack? Society says that, if apprehended, he must be warned of his legal rights to have an attorney, before he is permitted to confess. Then if the criminal is held beyond a short while before being taken before a magistrate, for charging and probable release on bond, a conviction would be reversed on constitutional grounds. Many persons stand ready to assist the offender in protecting his constitutional rights through all the courts of the land.

While society is weeping over the criminal, it is showing no such concern, indeed no concern, for the victim of his crime. Society is brutal toward the victims of crime, not against the criminals.

It is time that the Government of this Nation shows as much concern for the victims of crimes of violence against the person as for the people who commit the crime.

This is a situation which we have allowed to exist for too long. I think it is time that the Congress start now taking positive steps toward providing compensation for the victims of crimes of violence.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 2155) to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2155

A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—SHORT TITLE AND DEFINITIONS

Short title

SEC. 101. This Act may be cited as the "Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1964".

Definitions

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "child" means an unmarried person who is under eighteen years of age and includes a stepchild or an adopted child;

(2) The term "Commission" means the Violent Crimes Compensation Commission established by this Act;

(3) The term "dependents" means such relatives of a deceased victim as were wholly or partially dependent upon his income at the time of his death or would have been so dependent but for the incapacity due to the injury from which the death resulted and shall include the child of such victim born after his death;

(4) The term "personal injury" means actual bodily harm and includes pregnancy and mental or nervous shock;

(5) The term "relative" means his spouse, parent, grandparent, stepfather, stepmother, child, grandchild, brother, sister, half-brother, half-sister, or spouse's parent;

(6) The term "victim" means a person who is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in section 302 of this Act.

TITLE II—ESTABLISHMENT OF VIOLENT CRIMES COMPENSATION COMMISSION

Violent Crimes Compensation Commission

SEC. 201. (a) There established a Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which shall be composed of three members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, solely on the grounds of fitness to perform the duties of the office. The President shall designate one of the members of the Commission who has been a member of the bar of a Federal Court or of the highest court of a State for at least eight years, as chairman.

(b) No member of the Commission shall engage in any other business, vocation, or employment.

(c) The chairman and one other member of the Commission shall constitute a quorum; and where opinion is divided and only one other member is present, the opinion of the chairman shall prevail.

(d) The Commission shall have an official seal.

Terms and compensation of members

SEC. 202. (a) The term of office of each member of the Commission taking office after December 31, 1965, shall be eight years, except that (1) the terms of office of the members first taking office after December 31, 1965, shall expire as designated by the President at the time of the appointment, one at the end of four years, one at the end of six years, and one at the end of eight years, after December 31, 1965; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term.

(b) Each member of the Commission shall be eligible for reappointment.

(c) A vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(d) Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President for inefficiency, neglect of duty, or malfeasance in office.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level IV of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 except the chairman who shall be compensated at the rate prescribed for level III of such schedule.

Attorneys, examiners, and employees of the Commission; expenses

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission is authorized to appoint such officers, attorneys, examiners, and other experts as may be necessary for carrying out its functions under this Act, and the Commission may, subject to the civil service laws, appoint such other officers and employees as are necessary and fix their compensation in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949.

(b) All expenses of the Commission, including all necessary traveling and subsistence expenses of the Commission outside the District of Columbia incurred by the members or employees of the Commission under its orders, shall be allowed and paid on the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Commission or by any individual it designates for that purpose.

Principal office

Sec. 204. (a) The principal office of the Commission shall be in or near the District of Columbia, but the Commission or any duly authorized representative may exercise any or all of its powers in any place.

(b) The Commission shall maintain an office for the service of process and papers within the District of Columbia.

Powers and procedures of the Commission

SEC. 205. (a) Upon an application made to the Commission under the provisions of this Act, the Commission shall fix a time and place for a hearing on such application and shall cause notice thereof to be given to the applicant.

(b) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, may hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member. The Commission shall have such powers of subpena and compulsion of attendance and production of documents as are conferred upon the Securities and Exchange Commission by subsection (c) of section 18 of the Act of August 26, 1935, and the provisions of subsection (d) of such section shall be applicable to all persons summoned by subpena or otherwise to attend or testify or produce such documents as are described therein before the Commission, except that no subpena shall be issued except under the signature of the Chairman, and application to any court for aid in enforcing such subpena may be made only by said Chairman. Subpenas shall be served by any person designated by the said Chairman.

(c) In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is a child, the application may be made on his behalf by any person acting as his parent or guardian. In any case in which the person entitled to make an application is mentally defective, the application may be made on his behalf by his guardian or such other individual authorized to administer his estate.

(d) Where any application is made to the Commission under this Act, the applicant, and any attorney assisting the Commission, shall be entitled to appear and be heard.

(e) Any other person may appear and be heard who satisfies the Commission that he has a substantial interest in the proceedings.

(f) Where under this Act any person is entitled to appear and be heard by the Commission, that person may appear in person or by his attorney.

(g) Every person appearing under the preceding subsections of this section shall have the right to produce evidence and to cross examine witnesses.

(h) The Commission may receive in evidence any statement, document, information, or matter that may in the opinion of the Commission contribute to its functions under this Act, whether or not such statement, document, information, or matter would be admissible in a court of law.

(i) If any person has been convicted of any offense with respect to an act or omission on which a claim under this Act is based, proof of that conviction shall, unless an appeal against the conviction or a petition for a rehearing or certiorari in respect of the charge is pending or a new trial or rehearing has been ordered, be taken as conclusive evidence that the offense has been committed.

(j) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to the proceedings of the Commission.

Attorneys fees

SEC. 206. (a) The Commission may, as a part of any order entered under this Act, determine and allow reasonable attorney fees, which if the award is more than $1,000 shall not exceed 15 per centum of the amount awarded as compensation under section 301 of this Act, to be paid out of but not in addition to the amount of such compensation, to the attorneys representing the applicant.

(b) Any attorney who charges, demands, receives, or collects for services rendered in connection with any proceedings under this Act any amount in excess of that allowed under this section, if any compensation is paid, shall be fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Finality of decision

SEC. 207. Except as otherwise provided in this Act, orders and decisions of the Commission shall be final.

Regulations

SEC. 208. In the performance of its functions, the Commission is authorized to make, promulgate, issue, rescind, and amend rules and regulations prescribing the procedures to be followed in the filing of applications and the proceedings under this Act, and such other matters as the Commission deems appropriate.

TITLE III—AWARD AND PAYMENT OF COMPENSATION

Awarding compensation

SEC. 301. (a) In any case in which a person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of the offenses listed in section 302 of this Act; and

(1) is within the "special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States" as defined in section 7 of title 18 of the United States Code; or

(2) in the case of an offense committed within the District of Columbia, is a violation of title 22 of the District of Columbia Code, the Commission may, in its discretion, upon an application, order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

(b) The Commission may order the payment of compensation—

(1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or

(2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or

(3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

(c) For the purposes of this Act, a person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reason of age, insanity, drunkenness, or otherwise he was legally incapable of forming a criminal intent.

(d) In determining whether to make an order under this section, the Commission may consider any circumstances it determines to be relevant, including the behavior of the victim which directly or indirectly contributed to his injury or death.

(e) No order may be made under this section unless the Commission, supported by substantial evidence, finds that—

(1) such an act or omission did occur; and

(2) the injury or death resulted from such act or omission.

(f) An order may be made under this section whether or not any person is prosecuted or convicted of any offense arising out of such act or omission. Upon application from the Attorney General, the Commission may suspend proceedings under this Act for such period as it deems appropriate on the ground that a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission has been commenced or is imminent.

Offenses to which this Act applies

SEC. 302. The Commission may order the payment of compensation in accordance with the provisions of this Act for personal injury or death which resulted from offenses in the following categories:

(1) assault with intent to kill, rob, rape, or poison;

(2) assault with intent to commit mayhem;

(3) assault with a dangerous weapon;

(4) mayhem;

(5) malicious disfiguring;

(6) threats to do bodily harm;

(7) lewd, indecent, or obscene acts;

(8) indecent act with children;

(9) kidnapping;

(10) murder;

(11) manslaughter, voluntary;

(12) attempted murder;

(13) rape;

(14) attempted rape.

Nature of the compensation

SEC. 303. The Commission may order the payment of compensation under this Act for—

(a) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the personal injury or death of the victim;

(b) loss of earning power as a result of total or partial incapacity of such victim;

(c) pecuniary loss to the dependents of the deceased victim;

(d) pain and suffering of the victim; and

(e) any other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

Limitations upon awarding compensation

SEC. 4. (a) No order for the payment of compensation shall be made under section 301 of this Act unless the application has been made within two years after the date of the personal injury or death.

(b) No compensation shall be awarded under this Act in an amount in excess of $25,000.

(c) No compensation shall be awarded if the victim—

(1) is a relative of the offender; or

(2) was at the time of the personal injury or death of the victim living with the offender as his wife or her husband or as a member of the offender's household.

Terms of the order

SEC. 305. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this section any order for the payment of compensation under this Act may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate.

(b) The Commission shall deduct from any payments awarded under section 301 of this Act any payments received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this Act), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this Act.

TITLE IV—RECOVERY OF COMPENSATION

Recovery from offender

SEC. 401. (a) Whenever any person is convicted of an offense and an order for the payment of compensation is or has been made under this Act for a personal injury or death resulting from the act or omission constituting such offense, the Commission may institute an action against such person for the recovery of the whole or any specified part of such compensation in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides or is found. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear, determine, and render judgment in any such action.

(b) Process of the district court for any judicial district in any action under this section may be served in any other judicial district by the United States Marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any action under this section is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

Reports to the Congress

SEC. 501. The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress annually a report of its activities under this Act including the name of each applicant, a brief description of the facts in each case, and the amount, if any, of compensation awarded.

Penalties

SEC. 502. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18 of the United States Code shall apply to any application, statement, document, or information presented to the Commission under this Act.

Appropriations

SEC. 503. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Effective date

SEC. 504. This Act shall take effect on January 1, 1966.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana such time as he may require.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

CONGRESS AT THE TWO-THIRDS POINT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it seems an appropriate time to evaluate and assess what the Senate and the Congress have been able to do at a time which may very well be two-thirds of the way into the 1st session of the 89th Congress.

The Congress has done a good job this session from the outset. On January 4, at 9 p.m., the President delivered his state of the Union message. By Inauguration Day, Congress had already received the President's recommendations on health care, including so-called medicare, education, immigration, foreign aid, and defense.

To date, Congress has received 33 special messages and some 12 executive communications containing legislative recommendations from the President. Congress has completed action on 26 of these recommendations, 1 conference report is ready for filing and 5 more are still in conference, 3 others have passed both Houses amended, 12 more have passed the Senate, 25 others are either on the House or Senate calendars ready for early action, and numerous others are about ready for early reporting by the various committees, with hearings in progress on most of the remainder.

For those who like specifics, Congress has completed action on—

The three appropriation supplementals, including Vietnam, and one fiscal 1966 appropriation for Interior and related agencies;

A $1.1 billion measure to aid the economically underdeveloped 11-State Appalachian region;

A $2.5 billion atomic energy authorization;

A major reform in the Bureau of Customs placing some 53 collectors under civil service;

An authorization of $1 million to replace the bombed-out chancery in Saigon;

A $114.2 million Coast Guard authorization;

A bill implementing the International Coffee Agreement;

A 3-year, $30 million extension of the Disarmament Act;

An authorization of $1.344 billion in Federal aid for fiscal 1966 for elementary and secondary schools, a bill which the President described as "the most significant step of this century to provide widespread help to all of America's schoolchildren";

A 1-year extension of the National Commission on Food Marketing established in 1964 to study and appraise the marketing structure of the American food industry;

A bill repealing the requirement of 25-percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retaining the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation;

An authorization of a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year;

A bill reducing excise taxes by approximately $4.6 billion;

An increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund;

An extension of the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, and $454 million for fiscal 1966;

An annual authorization of $15.4 billion for military procurement to assure an adequate defense posture;

An annual authorization of $5.2 billion for the space program;

An increase in the temporary national debt ceiling to $328 billion through June 30, 1966;

A bill supplementing the acreage allotment with the establishment of poundage quotas for all farms producing Flue-cured tobacco to reduce surpluses in this commodity, improve quality and increase exports;

A bill establishing prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple-purpose water-resource projects—conferees agreed, June 14;

A 4-year extension of the President's authority to reorganize the executive branch;

Amendments to the Charter of the United Nations increasing the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27; and

One-year extension, to July 31, 1966, of the International Wheat Agreement.

Bills now in conference are—

A 5-year extension of the authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and measles;

A $7.7 billion fiscal 1966 appropriation for the Treasury-Post Office Departments;

A proposed constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in event of Chief Executive's disability, and providing for filling a vacancy in the Vice-Presidency;

A bill authorizing Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; setting up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizing creation of river basin commissions for regional planning; and

The foreign aid authorization for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

Bills passed both Houses amended:

A bill creating an Administration on Aging to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, to administer grants, promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data;

A bill vesting authority to establish purity standards for water pollution control and authorizing $80 million in new grants; and

A bill increasing the fees payable to the Patent Office so it may recover a reasonable part of its costs.

Senate bills pending in the House:

The Voting Rights Act of 1965, guaranteeing Negroes their right to register and vote, which passed the Senate by a 4-to-1 vote.

A $665 million authorization in grants for public works and development facilities in economically distressed areas;

A bill providing for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia;

A $355,000 authorization to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming;

A bill providing for research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles;

A $364,310,000 authorization for the Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world;

A $115 million fiscal year 1966 authorization for the Peace Corps;

A bill establishing a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities;

A revision and consolidation of laws governing management of national stockpiles of critical and strategic materials;

A bill authorizing the VA to extend aid to distressed homeowners;

An expansion of the Water Research Act of 1964; and

Provided for an expansion of the Federal program of research and development in the field of saline water conversion through the authorization of $200 million in appropriations for the period ending fiscal 1972.

This record of work to date, Mr. President, is, I believe, a creditable one. It reveals a Senate and a Congress, along with the President, alert to the changing and expanding needs of the Nation. As far as the Senate is concerned, this body has acted in these months with a diligence and with a persistent and dig-

nified devotion to legislative duties in order that these needs might be considered and acted upon.

I want to take this occasion to thank, first, all Members of the Senate, on both sides of the aisle for the contribution which individually and as a group they have made to the Senate's achievements. The Members have extended to the leadership the mutual courtesy and forebearance and cooperation which have been the basic factors in the Senate's effective and productive operations of the past months. And I want to thank, too, all of the distinguished committee chairmen who have been most helpful in carrying out the special responsibilities which have been consigned to them by the Senate. And, I wish, also, to express again, as I have done on other occasions, my gratitude to the distinguished minority leader. He has, as always, contributed greatly to the work of the Senate by his understanding and unfailing cooperation. Sometimes we have been together on particular measures and sometimes we have been on opposite sides. But either way, he has my admiration and gratitude, as a dedicated Senator and friend and as a tower of strength to this body and to the Nation.

And, finally, I wish to thank the President for his contribution to the work of the Senate. He has provided a national leadership of a high order, and in so doing has helped the Senate to understand and to deal with the manifold issues of our times, as they are reduced to legislation. He has given us his full and courteous cooperation in a framework of a deep understanding of the individual responsibilities of the separate branches of the Government.

Put these factors together and there is a rough accounting for the work of the Senate and the Congress to date. If these factors continue to operate and I fully expect that they will, I trust that my earlier estimate of the completion of the work of this session by midsummer will have proved to be only slightly optimistic.

For those who desire still further detail, I ask unanimous consent to include a report containing a summary of all major Senate activity through June 17.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE ACTIVITY

Days in session	92
Hours in session	444:23
Total measures passed	342
Confirmations	35,840
Public laws	40
Treaties	2

AGRICULTURE

Food marketing: Extended for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make its final report to the President. Public Law 89–20 (Presidential recommendation.)

Tobacco: Provides an extension of time for filing 1965 tobacco allotment leases. Public Law 89–29.

Tobacco acreage-poundage marketing quotas: Supplements the acreage allotment program with establishment of poundage quotas for all farms producing flue-cured tobacco to reduce surpluses in this commodity, improve quality and increase exports. Public Law 89–12. (Presidential recommendation.)

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural supplemental: Appropriated $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation; allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt; and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and the merger of 17 regional offices. Public Law 89–2. (Presidential recommendation.)

Second supplemental, 1965: Appropriated a total of $2,227,563,977, with $349.7 million of this amount allocated for Appalachian aid. (Public Law 89–16. (Presidential recommendation.)

Vietnam: Appropriated supplemental of $700 million for airfields, military installations, ammunition and aircraft. Public Law 89–18. (Presidential recommendation.)

Interior Department and related agencies: Appropriated $1,212,739,070 for fiscal 1966. H.R. 6767. (Presidential recommendation.)

Treasury-Post Office: Appropriated a total of $7,698,669,000 for fiscal 1966. H.R. 7060 in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

ATOMIC ENERGY

AEC authorization: Authorizes $2,555,521,000 for AEC appropriations for fiscal 1966 construction, operations, and capital equipment; includes $704 million for weapons program, $2.5 million for merchant ship reactor program. Public Law 89–32. (Presidential recommendation.)

CIVIL RIGHTS

Voting Rights Act of 1965: Guarantees Negroes their right to register and vote. S. 1564 passed Senate May 26. H.R. 6400; House Calendar. (Presidential recommendation.)

CONGRESS

Arts and Antiquities Commission: Establishes a Commission on Arts and Antiquities of the Capitol and authorizes $15,000 for annual expenses. Senate Joint Resolution 65 passed Senate May 24.

Joint Committee on the Budget: Established a 14-member Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4 to 3 ratio. The purpose of the joint committee is to serve the Appropriations Committees year round with the same expertise as the Bureau of the Budget for the Executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are not included in the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 adopted March 9, 1965; House March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Coast Guard cutters: Authorizes $6,260,000 to replace 17 Coast Guard cutters taken from domestic service and sent to Vietnam. Public Law 89–21.

Coast Guard procurement: Authorized $114.2 million for U.S. Coast Guard for fiscal 1966 for procurement of vessels, aircraft, and construction of shore and offshore installations. Public Law 89–13. (Presidential recommendation.)

Military procurement: Authorized a total of $15,402,800,000 for fiscal 1966 with $8,958,300,000 allocated for aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels and $6,444,500,000 for research, development, test, and evaluation. Public Law 89–37. (Presidential recommendation.)

ROTC: Extends the statute of limitations for filing claims for mustering-out payments to January 30, 1966, and repeals the authority for such payments on July 1, 1966. H.R. 214.

Special allowances to Armed Forces dependents: Authorizes payment of special allowances and dislocation allowances to dependents of members of the uniformed services when the dependents are evacuated from an overseas danger area. Public Law 89–26.

Stockpile Act: Revised and consolidated laws governing management of national stockpiles of critical and strategic materials to provide Congress and the public with pertinent information; made procurement contracts subject to the Renegotiation Act, and facilitated disposal of surpluses. S. 28 passed Senate February 9. (Presidential recommendation.)

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorized the disposal of 200,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. Public Law 89–9.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

District of Columbia Board of Parole: Authorizes the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia, subject to the approval of the Board of Commissioners, to promulgate rules and regulations under which the Board of Parole, in its discretion, may discharge a parolee from supervision prior to the expiration of the maximum term or terms for which he was sentenced. Public Law 89–24.

District of Columbia bond requirements: Authorizes the court to set bond in an amount twice the value of the property being attached in the District of Columbia in any case in which the plaintiff states in his affidavit that the value of the property to be levied upon is less than the amount of his claim. S. 1321 passed Senate May 11.

District of Columbia work release program: Authorizes the District of Columbia courts to release selected offenders from prison confinement at specified hours of the day to obtain or engage in gainful employment. S. 1319 passed Senate May 11.

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1.1 billion in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region and established the Appalachia Regional Commission. The amount of $840 million will be in form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. Public Law 89–4. (Presidential recommendation.)

Debt ceiling increase: Increased the temporary national debt ceiling to $328 billion through June 30, 1966. H.R. 8464.

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28.

Gold cover: Repealed the requirement of 25 percent gold backing of commerical bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retained the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Public Law 89–3. (Presidential recommendation.)

Manpower Act of 1965: Extended the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1969, authorized $454 million for fiscal 1966, and provides up to 2 years' training in classrooms or on the job for persons unemployed because they lack education or

skills. Public Law 89–15. (Presidential recommendation.)

Pacific Northwest disaster relief: Provides assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, Nevada, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged in December 1964 and January and February 1965 as a result of catastrophic floods unprecedented in terms of high water and subsequent damage to roads, farms, residences, and industries. S. 2089.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965: Authorizes a total of $655 million in grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. S. 1648 passed Senate June 1. (Presidential recommendation.)

SBA disaster relief: Amends the Small Business Act to provide for an increase in the maturity of Small Business Administration disaster loans from 20 to 30 years; provides for a suspension of up to 5 years on the payment of principal and interest on disaster loans at the discretion of the Administrator; and increases SBA's revolving fund by $50 million. S. 1796 passed Senate May 7. House Calendar.

EDUCATION

Elementary and Secondary Education Act: Authorized $1.344 billion in Federal aid for elementary-secondary schools for fiscal 1966; a 3-year program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of children from low-income families; a 5-year program of grants for books and library materials; a 5-year program of grants for supplementary educational centers and services; a 5-year, $100 million authorization for construction and operation of regional facilities for educational research; a 5-year program for grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies; and a 2-year extension (through June 30, 1968) of Federal aid to impacted areas. Public Law 89–10. (Presidential recommendation.)

Institute for Deaf: Establishes a National Technical Institute for the Deaf for the purpose of providing a residential facility for post-secondary technical training and education for persons who are deaf in order to prepare them for successful employment. Public Law 89–36.

School construction: Authorized aid for school construction in certain impacted areas outside the continental United States. H.R. 5874 passed Senate amended June 11.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Annuity increase: Clarified the application of annuity increase in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1962. Public Law 89–17.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Construction in Guam and Virgin Islands: Improved facilities for enforcement officers of the Customs and Immigration and Naturalization Service on Guam and the Virgin Islands. S. 956 passed Senate April 21.

Dr. Jonas Salk: Designated April 12, 1965, to honor Dr. Jonas Salk and the National Foundation March of Dimes on the 10th anniversary of the announcement of the world's first effective vaccine against polio. Senate Concurrent Resolution 30 adopted April 7; House adopted April 8.

Father Jacques Marquette: Established a tercentenary commission to commemorate the advent and history of Father Jacques Marquette in North America. Senate Joint Resolution 53 passed Senate June 14.

Goddard Day: Designated March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry. Public Law 89–5.

Government employment of aliens: Authorized Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. S. 905 passed Senate April 21.

Jefferson National Expansion Memorial: Authorizes an increase from $17,250,000 to $23,250,000 in the appropriation authorization for the completion of the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial in St. Louis, Mo., in commemoration of the concept of westward expansion, the Louisiana Purchase, and all it has meant to the growth of America. S. 1576 passed Senate June 17.

Movable Property Act: Authorized the Secretary of Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving municipal and industrial functions under the same conditions and on the same terms as title transfers to irrigation districts or water users' organizations which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving irrigation functions. S. 1000.

Patent Office fees: Increased fees payable to the Patent Office in connection with patents and registration of trademarks. H.R. 4185 passed Senate, amended, June 15. (Presidential recommendation.)

Postal rates for volunteer fire companies: Includes volunteer fire companies within the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings. S. 390 passed Senate March 29.

Textile Fiber Products Identification Act: Permits the listing on labels of certain fibers constituting less than 5 percent of a textile fiber product. Public Law 89–35.

Wool Labeling Act: Authorizes FTC to exclude any headwear from the labeling requirements of the Wool Products Labeling Act if labeling is not necessary for the protection of the consumer. S. 836 passed Senate May 11.

HEALTH

Clean air: Requires standards and proposes regulations to control pollution from gasoline- and diesel-powered vehicles. Establishes a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory. Authorizes grants for research to improve methods for disposal of solid waste. S. 306 passed Senate May 18. (Presidential recommendation.)

Community health services extension: Extended for 5 fiscal years, 1966–70, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chonically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services. S. 510 in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

Loan cancellation: Authorized cancellation of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan to a physician or dentist who practices in a shortage area. S. 576 passed Senate January 28.

Water pollution control: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water and authorized $80 million in new grants to help States and localities develop new methods of separating combined storm-water and sewage-carrying sewer systems; increases the dollar ceiling limitations on individual grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. S. 4 passed Senate January 28; passed House, amended, April 28. (Presidential recommendation.)

Water pollution control—Federal installations: Provides for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. S. 560 passed Senate March 25.

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorized the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspections, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27. (Presidential recommendation.)

INDIANS

Indian adult education: Increased by $3 million (to $15 million) the authorization for Indian adult vocational education. Public Law 89–14.

Pueblo Indian irrigation charges: Extended to 1975 the authority initially granted the Secretary of Interior by the Act of August 27, 1935, to enter into contracts with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of some 11,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands within the district. S. 1462 passed Senate March 29.

Quinaielt Tribe of Indians: Provides for the disposition of $205,172.40 awarded by the Indian Claims Commission to the Quinaielt Tribe of Indians in settlement of their claim. Public Law 89–28.

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963 and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping. Public Law 89–23. (Presidential recommendation.)

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorized $30 million for fiscal years 1966–68 for the Disarmament Agency. Public Law 89–27. (Presidential recommendation.)

Foreign Agents Registration Act amendments: Strengthened the basic purpose of the original act by requiring complete public disclosure by persons acting for or in the interests of foreign principals where their activities are political in nature or border on the political. Such public disclosure will permit the Government and the people of the United States to be informed as to the identities and activities of such persons. S. 693 passed Senate April 5.

Foreign aid authorization: Provides authorizations for the current program in fiscal years 1966 and 1967; ends the foreign aid program as presently constituted on June 30, 1967, and, in the meantime, provides for a searching inquiry as to the best means of formulating and operating a program of foreign assistance after that date. H.R. 7750 in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

IMF: Authorizes an increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. quota in the International Monetary Fund, from $4.125 to $5.16 billion. Public Law 89–31. (Presidential recommendation.)

Inter-American Development Bank: Authorized a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the Fund which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. Public Law 89–6. (Presidential Recommendation.)

International Cooperation Year: Expressed the sense of Congress with respect to the 20th anniversary of the United Nations during International Cooperation Year. Senate

Concurrent Resolution 36. Senate adopted June 16.

Peace Corps authorization: Authorizes an annual appropriation of $115 million for fiscal 1966; provides two additional associate directors; and provides that the Director of the Corps shall hold no other additional office of an equal rank while serving as Director of the Corps. S. 2054 passed Senate June 2. House Calendar. (Presidential recommendation.)

Religious persecution: Expresses the sense of Congress against persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of religion. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 adopted by Senate May 14.

Saigon chancery: Authorizes $1 million for the construction of a chancery in Saigon. Public Law 89–22. (Presidential recommendation.)

United Nations Charter amendments: Increases the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15 and the membership of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27, to be elected on a geographic basis. Executive A ratified June 3. (Presidential recommendation.)

Wheat agreement extension: Extends the International Wheat Agreement to July 31, 1966. Executive B ratified June 15. (Presidential recommendation.)

U.S. domestic fishery resources: Authorizes the President, whenever it is determined that fishing vessels of a foreign country are operating to the detriment of U.S. conservation programs, to raise the duty on fishery products of the offending nation. S. 1734 passed Senate May 19. Returned to Senate May 20.

JUDICIAL

Illicit traffic in child adoption: Imposed Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the illicit traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care. S. 624 passed Senate March 22.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed constitutional amendment fixing conditions and procedures for succession of Vice President to the Presidency in event of Chief Executive's disability; provides for filling vacancy in the Vice Presidency. Senate Joint Resolution 1 in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

REORGANIZATION

Bureau of Customs: Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 provides for the modernization of the Customs Bureau by abolishing the offices of all Presidential offices and establishing these positions on a career basis. Offices abolished are 45 collectors of customs; 6 comptrollers of customs; and 1 appraiser of merchandise and 1 surveyor of customs. Effective May 25, 1965. (Presidential recommendation.)

Reorganization Act extension: Extended for 4 years to June 1, 1969, the authority of the President to transmit reorganization plans to Congress. S. 1135. Public Law 89–. (Presidential recommendation.)

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Agate Fossil Beds National Monument: Authorized $315,000 for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in Nebraska. Public Law 89–33.

Assateague Island National Seashore: Provides for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Viriginia. S. 20 passed Senate June 17. (Presidential recommendation.)

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorized $355,000 to establish the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10. (Presidential recommendation.)

Federal Water Project Recreation Act: Established prospective standard guidelines on the allocation and reimbursability of recreation, fish, and wildlife costs on Federal multiple-purpose water resource projects. S. 1229. Conferees agreed June 14. (Presidential recommendation.)

Fisheries Loan Act: Extends for an additional 5 years the fishery loan program administered by the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries; expands the scope of the present program to permit a loan to be made regardless of whether the vessel to be acquired will replace an existing vessel; and removes the present minimum annual interest rate of 3 percent and substitutes a formula for establishing the interest rate. S. 998 passed Senate June 16.

Flood protection: Authorizes the Federal Government to bear up to 5 percent of costs of utility relocations on projects covered by the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act when the local organization is unable to bear such costs or cannot do so without undue hardship. S. 199 passed Senate May 25.

Grand Coulee third powerplant: Authorizes $364,310,000 for Federal construction of a third powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River in the State of Washington, which will add 3.6 million kilowatts of generating capacity to the 2 million kilowatts of the two existing plants, making it the largest single hydroelectric development in the world. S. 1761 passed Senate June 16.

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorized up to $500,000 from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to extend the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. Public Law 89–39.

Mann Creek reclamation project, Idaho: Authorizes an additional $690,000 to complete the Mann Creek project in Idaho which, upon completion, will provide a supplemental water supply to 4,465 acres and a new water supply to 595 acres. S. 1582 passed Senate June 16.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorized $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson Unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson Unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land, with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorized $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribes' war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging and missionary activity. Public Law 89–19.

Pecos National Monument, N. Mex.: Provides for the establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico. H.R. 3165.

Pesticides: Amends the act of August 1, 1958 by continuing 3 years a study by the Secretary of Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides, on fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource. S. 1623 passed Senate April 29.

River basin authorization: Authorizes an additional $944 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for 13 river basin plans previously approved by Congress. H.R. 6755. Public Law 89–

River basin planning: Authorized Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. S. 21 in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

Saline water conversion: Provided for an expansion of the Federal program of research and development in the field of saline water conversion through authorization of an additional $200 million in appropriations for the period ending fiscal year 1972. S. 24 passed Senate June 16. (Presidential recommendation.)

Southern Nevada water project, Nevada: Authorizes $81,003,000 for the Federal construction of the southern Nevada water supply project, a single-purpose municipal and industrial water supply development to furnish water from Lake Mead to the cities of Las Vegas, North Las Vegas, Henderson, Boulder City, and Nellis Air Force Base. S. 32 passed Senate June 17.

Tualatin project, Oregon: Authorized up to $23 million for Federal construction of the multipurpose Tualatin reclamation project in Washington County, Oreg. S. 254 passed Senate April 1.

Water Resources Research Act: Amends the 1964 Water Resource Research Act to authorize grant, matching, and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies undertaking special research in water resource problems. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1966 and increases the authorization by $1 million annually until the level of $10 million is reached. The ceiling of $10 million will remain thereafter. S. 22 passed Senate March 25. (Presidential recommendation.)

Yakima project, Washington: Authorized $5.1 million for the extension, construction, and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senated February 10.

SPACE

NASA: Authorized a total of $5,190,396,200 to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1966 as follows: Research and development, $4,536,971,000; construction of facilities, $62,376,350; and administrative operations, $591,048,850. H.R. 7717. (Presidential recommendation.)

TAXES

Motor fuel taxation compact: Grants the consent of Congress to New Hampshire, Maine, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Maryland and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. Public Law 89–11.

Excise taxes: Reduced excise taxes by $4.7 billion. H.R. 8371. In conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

TIME

Uniform time: Establishes uniform dates for commencing and ending daylight saving time in the States and local jurisdictions where it is observed. S. 1404 passed Senate June 3.

TRANSPORTATION

Navigation: Increased authorizations for the support and maintenance of the Permanent International Commission of Congresses of Navigation. S. 1501 passed Senate April 21.

Oceanographic vessels: Exempts oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws. S. 627 passed Senate April 29.

VETERANS

Reopened insurance fund: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to transfer up to

$1,650,000 from the veterans special term insurance fund, for the purpose of providing administrative expenses in connection with the reopening of national service life insurance. Public Law 89–40.

VA hospitals: Expresses sense of Congress on increasing the authorized bed capacity for all Veterans' Administration hospitals. Senate Concurrent Resolution 13 adopted June 4.

WELFARE

Older Americans Act: Creates an Administration on Aging, under direction of a Commissioner, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be a coordinating center for information and service to State and local governments, administer grants; promote research, gather statistics, and prepare and publish other data. H.R. 3708 passed Senate amended May 27.

National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities: Establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities to develop and promote a broadly conceived national policy of support for the arts and humanities throughout the United States. S. 1483 passed Senate June 10, 1965.

MISCELLANEOUS

Bank Merger Act Amendments, 1965: Amends the Bank Merger Act to require that future bank mergers should not be consummated until 30 days after the date of approval by the appropriate banking agency. S. 1698 passed Senate June 11, 1965.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota such time as he may wish.

Mr. McGOVERN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I believe that the war in Vietnam has taken a dangerous new turn with the commitment of large American land forces to a combat mission. Seventy-five thousand American soldiers are now committed to Vietnam, and every indication points to a total of at least 100,000 by next fall.

This in itself is a highly dangerous development, for it will inevitably invite a greater commitment of forces by the other side. The large North Vietnamese army which has thus far remained largely on the sidelines may be increasingly drawn into the fighting in the south. If that should happen on a large scale, it is clear that we would either be required to send in an army of several hundred thousand men or face a disastrous defeat or bloody stalemate out of all proportion to our interest in this corner of the globe. Nor does this prospect rule out the possibility of a confrontation with the huge armies of China backed by Russian air power and modern military equipment.

Mr. President, let us be clear on one point before we take this course. Our present commitment of U.S. combat forces on a sizable scale in South Vietnam is a radical departure from the advisory and assistance role which has heretofore been enunciated by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson and by Secretary of Defense McNamara.

In his original statement of U.S. aid to South Vietnam, President Eisenhower said on October 23, 1954:

> The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms.

On September 2, 1963, President Kennedy said:

> I don't think that unless a greater effort is made by the Government to win popular support that the war can be won out there. In the final analysis, it is their war. They are the ones who have to win or lose it. We can help them, we can give them equipment, we can send our men out there as advisers, but they have to win it—the people of Vietnam—against the Communists. We are prepared to continue to assist them, but I don't think that the war can be won unless the people support the effort.

On August 12, 1964, President Johnson said:

> The South Vietnamese have the basic responsibility for the defense of their own freedom.

In February 1964, Secretary of Defense McNamara told congressional committees:

> I think we must recognize that success in the counterinsurgency campaign in South Vietnam depends primarily upon the South Vietnamese themselves. It depends upon their ability to construct a stable government. It depends upon their willingness to fight. It depends upon the competency with which they are led. It depends upon the extent to which their government deserves and receives the loyalty of the people, and the support of the people. All of these conditions are conditions that additional men and equipment from the United States are not likely to advance.

These statements make it perfectly clear that we did not go into southeast Asia to fight a major war with American forces. We are now following a course which is sharply at variance with the advisory and supporting role previously spelled out by three Presidents.

Yet, dangerous as this prospect is, an even more foolish course is now emerging as the recommendation of certain Republican spokesmen who seem to be calling for victory over the Vietcong guerrillas by massive U.S. bombing attacks on China and North Vietnam.

Mr. President, how long will it take for some people to realize that bombing Hanoi or Peiping will have little or no effect on the guerrilla forces fighting a thousand miles away in the jungles around Saigon? These guerrillas have lived for 20 years largely off the countryside. They have fought largely with captured weapons. Their strength is that they are a part of the people and the terrain in which they fight. They live with the villagers and the peasants and in many cases are farmers by day and fighters by night. To bomb them is to bomb the women and children, the villagers and the peasants with whom they are intermingled. To destroy their crops and jungle foliage is to destroy the countryside on which the general population depends. Thus, our bombing attacks turn the people against us and feed the fires of rebellion that strengthen the guerrilla cause.

In a recent U.S. bombing attack aimed at the guerrillas, newsmen reported that three out of four people seeking treatment after the raid for the cruel burns of napalm bombs were village women and children.

How much more ineffective it would be to start dropping bombs on the masses of humanity piled up in the cities of North Vietnam and China. This would not slow down the Vietnamese rebel forces thousands of miles to the south. It would simply destroy the moral and political influence of the United States in Asia. It would turn Asia into a seething sea of hatred against America from which we might never recover. It could insure a Communist takeover in southeast Asia and perhaps all of Asia and the utter collapse of American influence in that part of the world.

Instead of this futile course, I would urge that we take advantage of the forthcoming Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers to encourage discussions with the Vietcong leaders in South Vietnam. Perhaps the Algerian hosts of this Conference could provide a useful contact with the National Liberation Front that speaks for the Vietcong. President Johnson has very wisely offered to enter into negotiations leading to an honorable settlement of the war without preconditions. The administration has, however, excluded the Vietcong from such negotiations. That exclusion may be unwise and may be the chief barrier to negotiations. After all, the principal antagonists in this struggle are the government in Saigon which remains in power with U.S. backing, and the Vietcong rebel forces which enjoy the support of Hanoi and Peiping. For us to insist that only Hanoi and Peiping can negotiate for the Vietcong is to presume a Communist monolithic bloc in southeast Asia that may be a creature of our own misconceptions. Nor do we have any claim to be the principal negotiator for South Vietnam. That is the function of Saigon. I sometimes think that the Government and the people of South Vietnam have been lost sight of in this strange and tragic war.

In any event, to refuse to include the National Liberation Front of the rebel forces in negotiations would be similar to King George III insisting 185 years ago that he would negotiate with our French ally but not with Gen. George Washington and his rebel American forces.

I am told that the administration objects to discussions with the Vietcong because this might undermine the South Vietnamese government. But governments have been falling in Saigon with regularity every few weeks for the past 2 years. Furthermore, the government in Saigon has repeatedly expressed the fear that the United States is taking over the war so completely that it has the effect of undercutting the Saigon government in the eyes of its people.

If we are concerned about discussions with the Vietcong undermining the South Vietnamese Government and I think that is a legitimate concern—there are two safeguards we could fol-

low. First, we could encourage the South Vietnamese Government to initiate such discussions with the Vietcong, or second, we could and should give assurances to Saigon that any negotiations in which we are involved will be in cooperation with our South Vietnamese ally.

As one respected American editor put it:

> The administration's mistake hitherto has been to point to a door marked "unconditional discussion," which has also been marked, "no admittance for the Vietcong," thus inhibiting a response from any quarter. To take down that inhibiting sign calls for political courage by President Johnson—almost as much as was displayed by General de Gaulle when he proposed entering into peace talks with the Algerians. But the alternatives now seem reduced to two: American withdrawal without parley as demanded by Peiping and Hanoi, or the commitment to South Vietnam of several U.S. fighting divisions which will bear the brunt of 5 or 10 more years of jungle war.

Mr. President, before we drift or plunge into either of these unfortunate alternatives, I hope and pray that the Senate will engage in long and painstaking debate about the essentials of our present foreign policy. Do we intend to rush into every revolutionary situation in the world on the theory that we have a mandate to impose an American solution? Do we intend to work with or against the powerful nationalistic and social forces now convulsing Asia, Africa, and Latin America? Do we assume that all Communist or Socialist states are "one ball of wax" and that we must resist them all down to the last American soldier, or can we live in peace with "Titoist" type regimes, including, perhaps, even Ho Chi Minh? Will we forever insist on denying the existence of a government on mainland China—the most populous nation in the world? What is the role of the United Nations and other peacekeeping agencies in the troublespots of the world? How effective is military power in areas of overriding human misery, hunger, and disease? Do we understand the sources of Communist appeal to the neglected peoples of the world? Are we using our own strongest moral, political, and economic weapons including our food and technical knowhow to the best advantage in our competition with the Communists? Is southeast Asia so vital to our interests that it is sufficient cause for us to undertake world war III in that part of the globe?

These are some of the many questions that I hope the Senate will debate before we are committed so irrevocably to a course in southeast Asia that all debate and discussion is stilled by marching feet and exploding bombs.

Mr. President, I add one final thought:

Recent announcements that U.S. forces will engage in ground combat in Vietnam if requested by the Government of South Vietnam, comes at a particularly bad moment because of the continuing inability of that Government to get a grip on the situation.

If it were a question of the United States responding to a request for help from a government which was moving toward stability and control, that would be one thing. But the political standing of the Government of South Vietnam has grown weaker rather than stronger in recent weeks.

It is ironic that one newspaper—the New York Times—carried the story of the U.S. decision to allow U.S. troops to fight at the request of the South Vietnamese Government right next to a story about the expected fall of the South Vietnamese Government. This juxtaposition reemphasizes the fact that the problem in South Vietnam is first and foremost a political one. Military measures are also necessary at this time, but until a satisfactory political solution is reached in South Vietnam, military measures alone—bombings of North Vietnam, increased numbers of U.S. advisers, more modern equipment, or actual combat by U.S. troops—will not solve the problem.

There is a great contrast between the direction of U.S. policy in Latin America and in Asia. In the Dominican Republic, for instance, what began as a unilateral intervention is becoming more and more multinational and the responsibility of the Organization of American States. Yet, in South Vietnam, what began as a multinational enforcement of Geneva commitments is becoming more and more a unilateral intervention, in which even the South Vietnamese Government is playing a smaller role while the U.S. role continues to escalate.

I think we would be wise in Asia, as well as in Latin America, to avoid unilateral intervention and to work for multilateral support for our efforts. If it is impossible to get effective multilateral backing, I think that should be a clue to us that our policies and objectives may need reevaluation.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from South Dakota for his very thoughtful speech. I was not able to be present throughout the entire speech. I did not have the opportunity to read the speech prior to its delivery. Therefore, I am not prepared to say whether I agree with everything that was said. I believe that the speech was an extremely thoughtful contribution to the dialog on this very serious situation confronting us in southeast Asia.

All too frequently lately, I have noticed that the columnists, editorial writers, radio and TV commentators keep insisting that any discussion of our involvement in southeast Asia will somehow or other be misunderstood over there, and, therefore, we should not talk too much about it over here.

My comment about that is that I do not believe that we should qualify our freedom and our freedom of speech in this country based upon what might be thought by people who never had any freedom or freedom of speech.

We should not give up our freedom or our freedom of speech in this country merely because they do not understand what it is about since they have never experienced it.

I commend the Senator for a thoughtful and courageous contribution to this dialog, which should continue in a free society such as the one in which we live and hope to continue to live for all time to come.

APPOINTMENT OF GEN. WILLIAM F. McKEE TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7777) to authorize the President to appoint Gen. William F. McKee (U.S. Air Force, retired) to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, when President Johnson learned of the intention of Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, to resign, he began searching for a man to fill this high post—a relatively new post in terms of Government agencies—yet a post which requires the highest skill and knowledge of the art of aviation, the tact and diplomacy of an ambassador in dealing with and melding the interests of general aviation, commercial aviation, and the military, and the experience in Government in order to work with the various other government agencies, State and Federal, on aviation affairs and to carry out the desires of the Congress.

In selecting men and women to hold high and responsible positions in our Government, President Johnson has chosen well. His search to find the best person for the job and his refusal to accept anything less, whatever the pressures upon him were, have set new standards for the quality of leadership in government.

The man President Johnson has selected to be the next Administrator of the FAA, is, as much as any other Presidential appointee, a tribute to the President's wisdom and firm adherence to his rule—"the best man for the job."

Because of a provision in section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 requiring the Administrator to be a civilian, it was necessary for the President to ask the Congress to authorize him to appoint William F. McKee, a retired Air Force general, to be the Administrator of the FAA.

As a former Member of both Houses of the Congress the President is respectful of the prerogatives of the Congress and has conscientiously given great attention to the wishes of the Congress.

The bill to authorize the appointment of General McKee has been considered carefully by the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Public hearings were held by both committees and every interested person and organization were afforded an opportunity to testify. Both committees have registered their approval of the bill.

In substance, the bill waives in this one instance the requirement in section 301(b) that the Administrator of the FAA be a civilian. It permits General McKee to serve as Administrator and retain his rank as a retired Air Force general. General McKee would be entitled, as are all retired regular military

officers, to receive a portion of his military retirement pay under the Dual Compensation Act in addition to receiving the full civilian salary as Administrator.

The bill expressly states:

[That General McKee] shall be subject to no supervision, control, restriction, or prohibition (military or otherwise) other than would be operative with respect to him if he were not an officer on the retired list of the Regular Air Force.

The bill also expressly states the intent of the Congress that this is a one-time waiver of the requirement that a civilian serve as head of the Agency.

Any further action or waiver of this provision would require the passage of an act of Congress. Congress has done this, so far as the House is concerned. It is now up to the Senate to take some action.

I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending legislation to authorize the appointment of Gen. William F. McKee. I do not support this legislation because General McKee is a military man. I support the legislation because General McKee is an able administrator.

On June 23, 1964, I made certain remarks in the Senate Chamber concerning General McKee on the occasion of his forthcoming retirement, which took place on July 31, 1964. I read from my remarks about General McKee on that occasion as follows:

I wish to use this opportunity to take note of General McKee's able work and constructive contribution in the Nation's service.

An outstanding management man, General McKee's assignment as commander of the Air Force Logistics Command, and then as Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, brought to fruition many improvements in the support system of the Air Force which he had planned and directed.

The activities supervised by General McKee included both personnel procurement and training, and the complex materiel procurement and supply operation required to support our combat air forces.

General McKee stated his objective for the modern Air Force as follows:

"As we move farther into space, there will be no room for error—mechanical or human. Our efforts today are aimed at the flawless support systems of tomorrow."

During his duty with the Air Force Logistics Command, management improvements resulted in a reduction in manpower from 224,000 to 147,000 and requirements for spare parts were reduced by some $7 billion.

These increases in efficiency were not made by sacrificing support to the combat units. High-speed movement of priority and high-value material has reduced the inventory in the pipeline: use of electronic data processing equipment and improved communications can make requirements from the field quickly known; and maximum use of aircargo delivery methods and equipment can promptly provide the necessary equipment.

As vice commander of the Air Materiel Command, and later as commander of the Air Force Logistics Command, General McKee played a major role in eliminating the vast Air Force logistics complex overseas, which included large depots in Africa, France, England, Japan, and the Philippines. On his recommendation, a depot program for Spain, at a cost of many millions, was never built. As the oversea logistics complex was phased out, the Air Force went to a concept of direct support from the Zone of Interior. This resulted in very substantial savings in dollars and people. Perhaps more importantly, the combat effectiveness of our oversea units was significantly improved.

That is the end of the quotation from the statement I made on the Senate floor on June 23, 1964, in connection with the then pending retirement of Gen. William F. McKee from the Air Force.

He is an outstanding administrator. He is a man of great integrity. He has the confidence of the people of this country. He administered procurement programs in the Air Force running into billions of dollars without a word of doubt as to his able, dedicated, and outstanding performance in those critically important programs.

Mr. President, I support the legislation. I intend to support the nomination of General McKee. He is a man of great ability and I am convinced he will make an excellent Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield, with the permission of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], who has the floor.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Assuming for the moment what the Senator has said is correct, without contradicting the high opinion that the Senator from Washington has concerning General McKee, does the Senator feel, in all fairness to the general himself and to the Senate, that before the rest of the Senate should pass judgment on this man he should not go through the customary and regular procedures of the Senate by coming before a committee and having an open hearing as to his qualifications rather than having only individual testimony of persons who know him personally? No such hearing has been afforded in this case.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not think that is the issue. It is only a matter of time. He will be required to appear before the Commerce Committee in connection with his nomination.

This bill simply makes it possible for the President to submit his nomination.

Mr. HARTKE. That is the very essence of the proposition. This is no general purpose bill. The bill is directed to General McKee. Before the Senate passes the bill, it must pass judgment upon whether the man is qualified. The very essence of the question involved is that we are asked to pass a bill and to accept the judgment of some persons without being afforded the ordinary course of a hearing. In other words, we are asked to pass judgment on the Senate floor, then to have a hearing, and at that time pass judgment on the man for the second time.

Mr. JACKSON. I would not question for one moment the necessity of having General McKee appear before the Commerce Committee, however, I see no reason to require him to appear twice—particularly since he has not yet even been nominated.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator want me to accept his statement as authority? I have respect for him, but I do not believe that, under similar circumstances, the Senator from Washington would want to dispense with hearings on the nomination of a certain person merely because I thought he was of the highest quality.

Mr. JACKSON. I only say that I stand on my statement. If the Senator does not subscribe to it, obviously, he does not have to do so. I notice that the Senator circulated a letter questioning whether General McKee is an administrator. I think what I have said is quite pertinent to the letter the Senator sent to every Senator. I was speaking only to this issue which the Senator raised in his letter.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senator said that 1 week ago he was speaking on this bill, and the distinguished majority whip asked him what unusual qualifications General McKee has which make him the only person capable of holding the job of Administrator. He stated that he did not know, inasmuch as the Commerce Committee had not had an opportunity to question General McKee.

I am not saying he is the only man. The point is that not only was he a great officer in the Air Force of the United States, but he has been one of the outstanding administrators in the Pentagon. I know that of my own knowledge. He is a man of great integrity.

I am trying to answer the question raised in connection with the letter.

Mr. HARTKE. I am not denying the authorship of the statement or the letter. The only question is whether the Senate is entitled to do away with organic law for one man. That is the first point. The second point has to do with the regular procedures of the Senate which would require the man to come before the committee and state his qualifications, and at the same time give members of the committee an opportunity for examination.

Mr. JACKSON. The bill before the Senate is a condition precedent to taking up his nomination. It simply enables the President to submit his nomination. We cannot nominate him. The President makes the nomination does he not? This is exactly what was done in the case of General Marshall. There is a precedent for it.

Mr. HARTKE. Is there any question that the President intends to nominate the man if the bill passes?

Mr. JACKSON. I assume he does. May I ask the Senator, Is there any question in his mind as to whether he will have an opportunity to question General McKee?

Mr. HARTKE. I have a question, if the bill passes, as to whether we are going to be able to question him and understand what the qualifications of the nominee are without having a prejudgment by the Senate as to his qualifications.

Mr. JACKSON. The Senate is merely saying that, if the bill before the Senate passes, the President may appoint him. It does not say the President must appoint him. It provides that the President may appoint him with, and I emphasize, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate." Unless I am mistaken, I assume he will appear before the

Commerce Committee, and if any Senator wishes to interrogate him, he will have that opportunity. This bill does not make him Administrator. It does not constitute confirmation.

I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, who, I assume, will be in charge of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. The law clearly sets forth that the Administrator must be a civilian at the time of his appointment. The bill makes it possible to waive that section of the law so that a retired military man may be appointed.

We cannot have a nomination and we cannot call him before the committee to question him on his qualifications until the man is appointed by the President; and he cannot be formally appointed by the President until a bill is passed waiving that provision of the law.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. There is the further point that the committee decided to limit the exception to General McKee. It is not a bill which grants the exception to everybody.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill does not repeal the statute. It waives the requirement for one man only. The question is, if the President nominates this man—and the committee had a hearing—whether we should waive the law; whether his capabilities, record, and experience, were good enough that he would make a capable Administrator for the FAA, so that we should waive this requirement of the law for this one time, and only one time.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. The central issue is whether the President should have a right to nominate the best possible person for this position. That is the central question. The fact that General McKee happens to be a retired officer should not automatically disqualify him. I regret that some people are opposed to men who have served their country for many years with distinction.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator not believe that the Federal Aviation Act contains a policy statement with respect to that question?

Mr. JACKSON. Yes, but it is not immutable. It can be changed. We did it with respect to General Marshall. The first FAA Administrator was a career military man.

Mr. HARTKE. Why is there not a bill before Congress that the law be repealed, then?

Mr. JACKSON. What did we do in the case of General Marshall?

Mr. HARTKE. We did the same thing, and General Marshall moved out as fast as he could. Omar Bradley commented on that and said he did not think it was a good precedent.

Mr. JACKSON. Where did General Marshall go?

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator want what General Bradley said about that?

Mr. JACKSON. Where did General Bradley go?

Mr. HARTKE. No special law was needed or passed for General Bradley.

Mr. JACKSON. Did he not serve in the Veterans' Administration?

Mr. HARTKE. No special law had to be enacted exempting the provision that a civilian had to serve. No special law had to be passed for General Bradley.

Mr. JACKSON. I do not believe that the test is whether a special law has to be passed. The test, it seems to me, is whether the President shall have the right to nominate good people for high office, wherever he can find them; and when there is a special situation I hope that Congress still has the discretion and judgment left to pass on such matters recognizing that every rule must have its exceptions. That is what we are doing here today, it seems to me, Mr. President.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RUSSELL of South Carolina in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the man being considered today is, in my opinion, and with one exception, the best administrator I ever knew in the Department of Defense. The other is now the president of one of the world's great companies.

General McKee could make a great deal more money if he went into private business than he is receiving from NASA today. However, because of the extraordinary growth of that agency, he agreed to stay in Government and serve his country after 40 years as a remarkably able officer.

If General McKee takes this job at the request of the President, he will take a reduction in salary, because he will have to resign his commission in the Reserve and retire—which he would do—unless the proposed law is enacted.

I believe that point should be stressed.

I do not see why the Senate should punish this officer for being desired as a result of his extraordinary managerial capacity. I do not see why we should cause him to lose 50 percent of his retirement pay, which he would lose automatically if he should take this position.

To those of us who know him well, he is the kind of man needed, the way the world is today. When the President of the United States asks him to do a job—just as General Marshall did when President Truman asked him to go to China even though he had started his retirement—General McKee says, "I will do it."

There are many in Congress who assert that we should raise the salaries of military personnel. The able and distinguished chairman of the House Armed Services Committee says we should raise them even more than the administration has asked.

Mr. President, a few days ago the Secretary of the Navy made a graduation talk at the Naval Academy. He pointed out that of the 801 midshipmen in that graduating class, by the year 2007, based on the law of probability, 2 of those men will be at the top in the U.S. Navy. One will be the Chief of Naval Operations, the other the Vice Chief.

Mr. President, General McKee is the first four-star general in the history of the Air Force to attain four stars without being a flyer. The reason is his extraordinary managerial capacity. He is one of the two men who, some 40 years later, reached the top of his profession.

If he changes his job he will lose half his retirement pay over $2,000, so he would receive some $9,000 instead of $16,000.

Why should the Senate punish him for agreeing to serve in a position he is so well qualified to handle?

The distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], in my opinion, is the Senate authority on commercial aviation, as chairman of a Subcommittee on Aviation of the Commerce Committee, pointed out in committee yesterday that we need to develop a supersonic transport plane, and said it would cost approximately $2 billion.

Someone is going to make the decisions incident to that $2 billion.

There is no man in this country better qualified to make recommendations to the President on this subject than General McKee.

Some of us know who is behind much of the opposition to General McKee. They know that General McKee cannot be pushed around. No one is going to tell him what to do. He will do what he believes to be right for his country.

Mr. CLARK and Mr. PEARSON addressed the Chair.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I have already promised to yield to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], and am glad to yield to him now.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, let me say at the outset of this debate that I am in opposition to the bill. I have read the hearings. I have listened to the statement of the Senator from Washington reciting the qualifications of General McKee months before his name was ever submitted in relation to this bill. I have heard the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma in committee recite and endorse the qualifications of General McKee and his great experience. I have listened with great attention to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who has had a great deal of experience as a former Secretary of Air and in the Armed Services Committee. I have read his statement in the RECORD made a day or so ago. I therefore do not believe that there is any question about the qualifications of General McKee.

In the hearings conducted by the able chairman of the subcommittee, because of the nature of the bill, the question of General McKee's qualifications naturally arose, although he did not appear to testify.

Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that while I oppose the bill, if the Senate is going to pass it, and the Senate is going to approve the nomination, I believe, without any doubt, that I shall vote for confirmation of the nomination of General McKee.

However, the issue is not as the Senator from Washington has stated, whether we shall or shall not appoint a military man. The issue is whether we are going to adhere to the principles laid down in the act creating the Federal Aviation Agency, as to whether a civilian agency shall be administered by a civilian.

I understand and respect the position of a man who has been in the military service for many years that there is no opportunity for him to build up an estate of any kind. I can understand the benefits that are the right of his family, and the right that he has to go out into civilian life and earn, no doubt, a large salary. However, I believe that the provisions of this bill violate the principles of civilian control and civilian administration, and also the principle of the Dual Compensation Act passed last year.

That is the basis on which I oppose the bill.

Mr. MONRONEY. I respect the right of my distinguished friend from Kansas to disagree. He has a right to question the wisdom of waiving this provision in the act. Congress wrote the restriction in the first place. I happened to be the author of the act.

Mr. PEARSON. I acknowledge that fact.

Mr. MONRONEY. I know the reason why it was put in the act. At that time we were having a serious contest with the Air Force. The Air Force refused to comply with civilian aviation rules, and refused to file flight plans, or to even notify the civilian aviation agency when it was conducting refueling operations over major trunkline routes. They would not agree to any sharing, with the civilian components, of the air space. This was a good many years ago. That was the situation that prevailed at that time.

Mr. PEARSON. If the Senator will let me interrupt him at this point, it is my understanding that the Senator does not intend to repeal section 301(b), but only to waive it in this instance. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes. Section 301 (b) is good policy and should not be repealed.

This case involves the appointment of the Administrator for the Aviation Agency. That does not mean that Congress is confirming him in this post, because, as the distinguished Senator knows, the full process of confirmation will be gone through if he is appointed to the office, at which time General McKee will be called before the committee, and he will be questioned as to his ability and as to what he stands for and as to how he proposes to operate the Agency.

Any opposition witnesses who wish to be heard will be heard. This is not a matter of finality. This is merely a step in the proceedings.

Mr. PEARSON. The point is we are not debating his qualifications.

Mr. MONRONEY. We are not debating his qualifications. However, it is necessary to debate the need for a man of his qualifications in order to furnish justification for what I consider to be a reasonable waiver of the section which was written into the Federal Aviation Act. It is necessary to discuss the man, because otherwise we would not want to waive section 301(b).

Mr. PEARSON. I do not wish to be misunderstood. Does the Senator really believe that section 3 of the bill has any real validity in meaning?

Mr. MONRONEY. Section 301(b)?

Mr. PEARSON. No; section 3 of the bill, which states that this is a waiver for this particular time because of the peculiar circumstances that are involved. It is very similar to the language used in the act when General Marshall was appointed Secretary of Defense, which was a civilian post. We have done it once. Now we are about to do it a second time. Will we be asked to do it a third time?

Mr. MONRONEY. It was not done in the case of General Quesada. General Quesada, for reasons known to himself, chose to become a civilian. He had other financial means, and was not as concerned, perhaps, with the retirement pay that he had so justly accumulated. Therefore, he stripped himself of his military rank by resigning, and became a civilian. This bill would not be required today if General McKee were to forgo his accumulated 35 or 40 years of military retirement pay and became a civilian. In that case he would come before our committee as a civilian. Having resigned his commission, he would be confirmed as a civilian in the post of Administrator.

We are asking for the waiver because we do not believe he should forgo his years of valued, competent and able service to his Government in order to serve his Government a little longer in a post in which the President—and I concur in the President's view—feels he is most competent to serve.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator may have misunderstood me in part. I said we did it in the case of General Marshall.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. PEARSON. We are asked to do it in the case of General McKee for equally good reasons, no doubt. Will we be asked to do it a third time?

Mr. MONRONEY. At this point I would say that if a situation should arise in which there was not a civilian of extreme competence available, and a highly qualified military man were available, and if he possessed the required capabilities, then, since I do not distrust the military, we might want to waive it again. The situation must be faced at the time, the place, the man, and the need, as it arises. I do not see any reason why Congress should be denied the right to examine this act in the light of all the circumstances. Section 301(b) is a most essential part of the act. I believe it should stay in the act. Congress can always say, "We want to take a look at it to see if there is reason or justification for waiving it at this time."

There may be another time; and if there is, and if we find a man who can do the job, and we do not find a competent Democrat available for the job, I believe we should waive it again.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I should like to ask my friend from Oklahoma a question. I take it from what I have heard in the debate that Senators agree that General McKee is an able and loyal American citizen, and that no one has questioned his ability or integrity. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. That is my understanding.

Mr. CLARK. Assuming that to be the case, does the Senator agree with the statement which appears at page 4 of the committee report, which is a quotation from Executive Report No. 7, 86th Congress, 2d session:

> Furthermore, and perhaps most important, one of the basic principles of our society is that the control of government, including the policymaking function, should be vested in civilians with the military subordinate. Continued appointments of career officers could destroy the symbol of civilian government as well as promote the unfortunate practical effects associated with almost dominant military influence.

Does the Senator agree with that statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. I concurred in that language the time it was written, and I concur in it now. It is one of the main reasons why we are asking for a waiver instead of a repeal, because I am conscious of the necessity of guarding this point very carefully.

Of those who are listed by the FAA in its executive handbook, listing 298 of the top officials of FAA, only 9 are officers on active duty. That is a very small percentage.

Mr. CLARK. I take it that the answer of the Senator to my question is "yes." Does he agree with it?

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree.

Mr. CLARK. Is the Senator satisfied that there is no competent civilian who can be appointed to this post; that the United States has gotten into the unfortunate position where only this able four-star general is competent to carry on these duties, and therefore we must waive a sound principle of American constitutional law in order to get this four-star general? Is no civilian qualified, in other words?

Mr. MONRONEY. The President has searched for a long time trying to find some competent people to do the job, particularly in view of the prospect of our building the SST.

Mr. CLARK. What is the SST?

Mr. MONRONEY. The supersonic transport.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, I yield to the Senator on all matters pertaining to aviation, as I do also to the Senator from Missouri, because they know so much more than I about this subject. However, it is my opinion that we need a supersonic transport about as much as we need a hole in the head.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the Senator's opinion. My opinion differs from his. If we do build it, we should have a good manager. General McKee is a manager of extraordinary competence. He is experienced in aviation. He en-

joys the confidence not only of the civilian community, but of the military community as well. Let us not forget that 35 percent of all the airspace is used by the military.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It occurs to me that the candid, honorable, and right way to do what is sought is not to ask for another exception, continuing the creeping control of the military over the civilian aspects of our Government, which in my judgment has gone much too far already. It has gone so far that in my opinion the Pentagon is now running the State Department. The candid thing to do is to repeal the provision of law which prevents the military man from being the head of this Agency, and let us really start down the road toward a military dictatorship.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I always thought that the State Department ran the Pentagon. That has been my opinion.

I should like to answer the inquiry of the Senator from Pennsylvania. I suppose that many people in the United States would fall within the criteria of the job about which we are talking. But most of them would not take the job. I would suspect that any of those who are as qualified in that particular field as is General McKee would have to sacrifice much more in pay, whether they are retired military people or competent scientists or engineers, than General McKee would receive.

The problem is not whether the United States is devoid of people who could do the job. The problem relates to the availability of qualified people.

At the time the original bill was passed, the distinguished subcommittee chairman, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], knows that we were in the throes of a real controversy between the military and civilians. The problems involved safety and other things of that character. As the Senator knows, we separated functions and made the FAA practically a safety division.

If that was their only function now, I would think that a man of McKee's experience and ability to be the Administrator of FAA would not even be suggested. But over the years the FAA has expanded. It has been getting along with the military. Joint rules have been worked out. A great deal more stability in the safety rules of U.S. aviation has been created.

Then there were some private pilots who, we must be frank, always have some problems with the FAA. They did not like the idea of a military man being head of the Agency. I suppose when we were talking about the subject years ago many of those pilots had recently come from the military. Senators who have been in the military know that when a man is about ready to get out of the military service, he does not wish to see any more sergeants, officers, or other military personnel.

At that time the Senator from Oklahoma and the other members of the committee wisely decided that only one of the top jobs in the FAA, either the office of Deputy or the Administrator, could be occupied by a career military man.

At the time that General Quesada was appointed—and I do not believe that General Quesada would mind my suggesting it now—he had a rough time with some of the civilian pilots. There was a great deal of conflict. I wish to be perfectly fair about it.

General McKee is not an aviator. Since then the FAA has taken on many more duties, one of which I think is most important. That is the duty of liaison between the Federal Aviation Agency and NASA with relation to our future in the sonic field. We might have come to the same view to which the Senator came, for the question involved the space field.

A short while ago we had in the Senate Chamber those fine young astronauts. We were down in the Appropriations Committee talking with representatives about appropriations for that agency. It was appropriate that the astronauts should come at this time. Their visit saved me a great deal of trouble in the committee. I believe the appropriation will get along nicely.

So the situation has changed. We have looked around for available people who would be objective, because there is a great deal of competition between FAA research and development and NASA. McKee looked like the one we needed, because of his experience in the Air Force. I believe the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] knows about that. I do not believe that anyone searched or scoured the United States to determine whether he was the best man, but McKee was found, and he had the problem about which we are now speaking.

In view of the future of aviation in many fields, we think General McKee seems to be the best man available, and we desire to make an exception to the rule.

The Senator from Oklahoma was absolutely correct in his answer to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON]. I suppose there will be another exception. I do not know. We thought that when General Marshall was named, it was a time to reverse the rule. We thought that a time to reverse it occurred when the name of General Quesada was before the Senate. In the fast-moving technological air space age that we are getting into, there may be several occasions on which an exception must be made. I do not know. But as the Senator from Oklahoma has said, each requested exception must stand upon its own merits, its own facts; and if the facts do not justify the request, we would be the last to suggest that an exception be made.

The peculiarity of the facts in the present case justifies the exception. No one over the years in aviation has been more concerned about the encroachment of the military, the running of it or getting into it deeply, than the Senator from Oklahoma. I was surprised. I thought that when he looked at the proposal he would be reluctant to act. But after he looked at the facts, he decided that he would support the measure.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to make my position clear to both the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think that fairly well states the history of the act.

Mr. CLARK. If Senators desire to put the military on top and not on tap, I am quite prepared to pay whatever difference there may be in retirement allowances or extra perquisites by reason of waiving or giving up of pension rights, or whatever else is necessary in order to get this fine man, General McKee. I am sure an excellent man has been picked. Perhaps he is the best man. What I am saying is, "If you go looking around, as you do every time, for military personnel to put into civilian jobs, for goodness sakes let us change the law and not come in here with what is essentially a private bill."

Mr. MONRONEY. This a private bill dealing with one man because he has the competence that we need. I would refuse to introduce a bill that would in effect say, "Go to the Air Force and pick out a general to head this agency." But for General McKee I would have introduced a bill if the chairman had not; and I support it because I know he has competence greater than anyone else who is available at what the Federal Government can pay a man for the job. If we paid twice the amount involved we could not find a man whose experience in all phases of aviation was as diversified and complete.

Mr. CLARK. In other words, he is the indispensable man. Is that correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. He is the best available man that we can find today. If we expect to take an inferior man because of the prejudice against the Air Force, Senators who wish to vote that way can do so. But I am not among them.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I remember discussions on the floor of the Senate when the nomination of John McCone came before the Senate to be Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. No one in the Senate today would say that John McCone did not make a good Director of the CIA. But at the time the Senate considered the confirmation of his nomination, we heard that he was a former Pentagonian and a successful businessman. Seldom has a man left the service of the Government who received more accolades than did John McCone. It was well for the country that the Senate decided to trust him in this vital job.

What is one of the big arguments against W. F. McKee? One is that he is a general, in other words he has been successful. Out of a class of hundreds of men, he rose to be No. 2.

McKee offered to give up the money to take the job because his President asked him to take it. He will lose nearly half

his retirement pay. Why do we now plan to take it all?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will gladly yield when I finish my sentence. Do we want to say "Because you are successful, because you are the best man the President can find, because those of us who are interested in aviation believe you are the best man that the President can find, we feel you should lose all of your rights as a Reserve officer, including your retirement pay"?

I do not believe that is just. I know the young officers. I have worked with them and lived with them. They watch what happens to those ahead nearer the twilight of their careers. They are vitally interested in their retirement status.

I have known able young captains and majors who were offered positions in the Government. Uppermost in their minds is what their rights are.

I wish the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] were here today. He is an authority on this subject.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish he were, too. The senior Senator from Georgia expressed his view to me, and he told me I was right. I wish he were here. I am sorry about the death in his family. I think he would be on our side.

The point is that the Senator from Missouri consistently and insistently says that the issue concerns the qualifications of General McKee. As the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] pointed out, we are not talking about his qualifications now, unless the Senator from Missouri would have the Senate precluded from going into hearings on his qualifications.

In this case, the Senator from Missouri is, to all intents and purposes, conducting the actual hearing on General McKee without the benefit of having him present. Let me say one thing about the statement that he made about being willing to give up his rights. I do not know what he would say. I know what Mr. Macy said in the hearings before the House of Representatives, which were not even printed. I know what was said in the Senate hearings. It was said that General McKee could not afford to take the job. It was not said outright, but it was implied strongly that he would not accept this appointment unless this bill were passed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Indiana made that point about hearings to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. The Senator will have the right to question General McKee about his knowledge and thinking and background and record; his obligations, if any, to military and civilian organizations interested in aviation. Every member of that great committee will have a right to question General McKee thoroughly.

After he has undergone the interrogations presumably the committee will meet in executive session and vote as to whether or not they believe he is capable of handling the job. But there would be no way to have such hearings unless we obtain this law in order to get the best man the President knows to do the job.

The chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. MAGNUSON] and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation [Mr. MONRONEY] are on the floor. Can they tell the Senate whether they intend to have any hearings, or if they merely intend to poll the committee to see whether the committee agrees to the confirmation of General McKee's nomination. I would ask the Senator from Oklahoma if he plans to hold hearings.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator from Oklahoma, who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Aviation, plans to hold hearings. The chairman of the Committee on Commerce is in the Chamber; he can speak for himself.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Hearings will be held.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure that the hearings will be as full and complete as the Senator from Indiana, or anyone else, desires them to be—open for full questioning. But no hearings on confirmation can be held unless a law is enacted making General McKee eligible for appointment.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on this point?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I believe I am the one who is responsible for the start of all this debate. I raised the question in committee. I shall vote for the bill, and I shall vote to confirm the nomination of General McKee because I believe he is qualified for the position; there is no question about that. But the law must be amended in order to allow a former military man to assume this responsibility.

The question I raised in committee is the question I should like to raise at this point. It should be understood that there is no trouble with this particular law; the trouble is with the basic law.

Sometime ago Congress made it permissible for the Government to hire back certain military people. The trouble in this instance is that we run up against the question of compensation each time such a proposal is made. What will be the compensation? Shall we allow such persons to receive a salary up to the full extent that the job is entitled to under the law, plus retirement pay? I thought it was absolutely wrong to do so unless we determined that the individual had a specialized ability that could not be engaged unless this concession were made.

I admit that there are times when it is necessary to rehire in the Government certain military personnel, so that the Government will not lose all their training and talent. But we must realize—and the people concerned should realize it, too—that they are being paid out of the same pocket. They are being paid by the taxpayers of the country.

The position in question pays $30,000 a year. Anyone who takes that position, no matter what his connections might be outside the Government, can receive only $30,000.

Mr. McKee already receives retirement pay as a former soldier. We must realize that he made no contribution toward that retirement pay. That retirement pay comes out of the same Treasury. Mr. McKee will end up getting $38,000 a year. In my opinion, that is wrong. We should preserve this man's rights so that when he does give up the position, he will not have lost his entitlement to his pension. But while he is serving the Government, and the Government has set the pay for the position at $30,000 a year, that is all he should get. That is the objection I raise.

I find no fault with General McKee. He should have this job. The only trouble is that he is now receiving $38,000 working for NASA. It would be an injustice to ask him to transfer from one job to another at this point and take a cut in pay of $8,000 a year. That is why the bill should be passed.

But I said before the committee that what should be done is to refer the bill to the Committee on Armed Services and let that committee restudy the whole problem.

We are beginning to appoint former military men as ambassadors. I can understand why that was done in the case of General Taylor. There was a special reason for him to go to Vietnam. But the idea of appointing former soldiers, who are receiving retirement pay, as ambassadors all over the world is wrong, if they are to receive double pay.

Those men must be made to understand that they are serving the Government that gave them their training, that enabled them to develop their talents to qualify for these positions. They ought to be willing to make sacrifices. But when they are appointed, they ought to get the top dollar. They ought to get what the job pays.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I do not have the floor. The Senator from Oklahoma yielded to me. If I have permission from him, I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield further to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator from Rhode Island referred to the dual compensation law, which contains some weaknesses. Yet, if we, at the time we passed the dual compensation law, had made the most detailed, the most thorough, the most in-depth examination of its application, and had referred it back to the Federal Aviation Administration Act, it would not have applied, because we are here talking about a civilian administrator.

Mr. PASTORE. That is correct. That is why it is necessary for Congress to amend the law. There is a double feature. Not only must the military prohibition be removed; the law must also specify the retirement provisions.

The serious question I raise is that after General McKee resigns from the

job, his retirement pay will be enhanced by that amount of money. His retirement pay will be his Army retirement pay plus his civil service retirement pay. I merely say that that seems to be an unjustified aggrandizement. I do not think General McKee wants that. He is getting his pay from NASA. He will be asked to assume another responsibility, and I do not think he should receive double pay.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in reply to the able and distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, concerning the details of what will happen if General McKee takes this job if the Senate confirms the President's nomination of General McKee as Administrator, he would receive the authorized salary of $30,000 to head the FAA.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. This matter has already been considered by Congress under what has been referred to as the Dual Compensation Act.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. I referred to that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, General McKee, if he were to take this job, would receive the first $2,000 of his retirement pay, plus only 50 percent of the balance.

Mr. PASTORE. Which means that he would be getting $39,000 for the job.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The retirement compensation would be $9,032.

As of today, serving NASA, General McKee receives $24,500, and, under the exception in the Dual Compensation Act, he receives his full retirement pay.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. His full retirement pay amounts to $16,065.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. At present his total compensation is $40,565. So, if the legislation were to pass after General McKee appears before the committee, and if the committee were to confirm him, he would take a cut of $1,533 to take the new job.

Mr. PASTORE. Not exactly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Exactly.

Mr. PASTORE. It would be the difference between $40,000 and $39,000.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would be the difference between $40,565 and $39,032, which would be $1,533.

Mr. PASTORE. The point I am making is that he would receive everything over $30,000, which would be more than the classification for the job would provide for anyone who would assume that responsibility.

That is where the unfairness comes in. We have a right to call military people back into service. However, when we call them back, the top dollar in compensation ought to be what the classification for the job provides.

Mr. SYMINGTON. $39,032.

Mr. PASTORE. No. The job pays $30,000. That is what it is. All we would have to do would be to suspend his retirement pay until such time as he becomes retired. He would then be getting $30,000 a year.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The general could go into 99 percent of the high-paying jobs in the Government and not sacrifice his pension, with the exception of that portion which comes under the Dual Compensation Act.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Because this job is specifically denied to a military man by statute, we must pass this bill. We would not wish to penalize the general if he were to choose to go into one particular job and not penalize his brother generals. General McKee could go into 99 percent of the high paying jobs and still draw his dual compensation pay, which would be $2,000 plus half of the remainder.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator is correct. I do not have any fault to find with General McKee. All I am saying is that the entire law should be reviewed in a very impersonal way.

Mr. MONRONEY. I agree.

Mr. PASTORE. We have people in Government who have given up a fortune to come to the Government and work for peanuts, relatively speaking. The fact that they can get a better job has nothing to do with it. That salary is all that the Government pays.

The fact still remains that, as few as they may be, that does not justify the fact that we must begin to make all these exemptions. I merely say that we ought to pass this law. We ought to conserve the experience of General McKee. We ought to give him this salary. There is no question about that. However, we should not stop with General McKee. We should review the entire law and bring it into the proper balance.

I shall vote for General McKee. I shall vote for this bill. And I hope that we can do it rather soon.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, there has been severe opposition to this bill—I repeat, to the bill and not to General McKee. I could spend many minutes listing the achievements and experience of General McKee and explaining why he is uniquely qualified to hold this office at this time. But since the objections are not directed at General McKee personally, suffice it to say that his experience as Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, having been responsible for research and development, procurement and supply, transport operations; the 9 years' experience he had in command and management responsibility for the Air Materiel Command, directing the work of more than 150,000 employees engaged in aviation occupations and professions throughout the country and abroad; and the experience he acquired during this last year in evaluating the program of NASA in advanced science and technology, particularly relating to aeronautical research and development, are a guarantee that he will be an able Administrator of the FAA.

The objections of some Members of the Congress are threefold:

First. That section 301(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 should never be violated by the appointment of a military man as Administrator.

Second. That if a military man serves as Administrator, he should not be permitted to receive his military retirement pay.

Third. That the appointment of General McKee would be a further step toward control of our Government by the military.

I believe Congress decision that the Administrator of the FAA should be a civilian was wise and I would strongly oppose any attempt to repeal this provision of our organic aviation law. But this provision must be considered in the light of the problems in aviation at the time the act was passed.

In 1958, and for many years prior thereto, there was a great conflict between the military users of airspace and the civilian users. Frankly, the military attitude was "we will take what we want of the airspace; use it as long as we want and for whatever purpose we want, and the civilian users can have what is left." Such an attitude created grave air safety problems and was detrimental to the development of a strong national air transportation system.

There were other areas in which civilian and military aviation were in conflict. As has been the tradition in this country, it was decided that there should be civilian control of our airways.

This did not mean, however, that there should never be a man with a military background as Administrator—nor did it mean that the military was to be subjugated completely to civilian control with no participation in aviation decisions.

Section 302(b) of the act specifically provides that the Deputy Administrator of the FAA may be a military man—even a military man on active duty. That section further provides, however, that no military man can serve as deputy "if the Administrator is a former Regular officer of any one of the armed services." Thus, by the very language of the act, Congress recognized that someone with a military background would and could serve as Administrator.

The prohibition in the act, therefore, is not directed against a man with military experience. Rather, it is directed at someone who is either on active duty or on the retired list. But military experience and a military background are the same, whether a person is an active duty, retired, or resigned.

Section 302(c) of the act expresses Congress intent that the military should have a voice in the decisions of the Agency and provides for the participation of military personnel to assist the Administrator in carrying out his function "relating to regulation and protection of air traffic, including provisions of air navigation facilities, and research and development in respect thereto, and the allocation of air space." This is necessary for reasons of national defense and so that the Administrator will be fully

advised of the needs and air space problems of the military. Section 302(c) provides that military men detailed to serve in the FAA shall not be subject to the direction or control of the military branch in which they serve.

The Administrator must report to the Congress semiannually on the participation of military personnel in the Agency. The last report of the Administrator disclosed that as of May 1965, there were 94 military personnel assigned to the Agency. This is 94 military personnel out of a total employment in excess of 45,000.

Perhaps the greatest hue and cry over the appointment of General McKee is in regard to the compensation he will receive. This is most surprising, and I can only conclude that the opposition comes from those who are either unaware that the Congress passed the Dual Compensation Act in August of last year or from those who are unfamiliar with the provisions of that act.

From the intensity of feeling of those opposed to this bill, you would think that *a special exception* is being made in the case of General McKee, so that he may be paid more than any other retired military man. You would think that this is a bill to confer special benefits and privileges on General McKee.

Nothing could be further astray from fact. General McKee will be paid $30,000 a year for his services as Administrator of the FAA. This is the value Congress has placed on that job and is the compensation for the services rendered in carrying out its duties and responsibilities. It is a full-time job, and General McKee will be a full-time Administrator. Surely his services are worth the $30,000 as much as the services of any civilian.

In addition to the $30,000—and completely separate and apart from any function General McKee might perform as Administrator—he will receive $8,404 in military retirement pay. This is, in substance, deferred compensation for his years of service as an active military officer. In General McKee's case, this represents a reduction in pay from that which he is currently receiving as Assistant Administrator for Management Development of NASA.

I do not think this is the time to debate the merits of the Dual Compensation Act as it applies to retired Regular military officers. The only reason a special bill is required for General McKee is because of the requirement that the Administrator be a civilian. Otherwise, the President could appoint General McKee without special legislation, and there would have been no question about the compensation he would receive.

But I must comment briefly on the Dual Compensation Act. Enlisted military personnel and retired Reserve officers have for many years been permitted to fill civilian Federal Government posts and draw full salary plus full military retirement pay. Many retired Regular military officers, however, were prohibited by a maze of complicated and numerous laws from even holding a civilian position, much less also receiving military retirement pay.

To correct this inequity and to provide for uniform treatment of retired Regular officers, the Congress last year passed the Dual Compensation Act, which permits a retired Regular officer to serve in a civilian position and to receive $2,000 of his military retirement pay plus one-half of the remainder in excess of $2,000. This applies uniformly to all retired Regular officers except those disabled in combat, no matter what their rank and no matter what their civilian positions.

I might add that retired Reserve officers are still permitted to draw full civilian salary and full military retirement pay.

Therefore, no exception is being made for General McKee as far as his compensation is concerned. He will be receiving the usual compensation for his services as Administrator and a portion of his military retirement pay—a portion to which all retired regular officers are now entitled.

Those who disapprove the Dual Compensation Act should more appropriately direct their criticism against that act, not this bill to authorize the appointment of General McKee. Those who believe that act should be changed should propose bills to amend it. I assure them that I, as chairman of the Senate committee to which such bills would be referred, will give prompt and fair consideration to any suggestions that might be made.

But dissatisfaction with the provisions of a law passed by the Congress concerning dual compensation should not be a stumbling block to the appointment of a man whom the President needs at this time to carry out the functions of an important government agency.

To those who fear military domination of our Government, I can only say that I am opposed to military domination also. I would disagree with them that we are in such danger at the present time.

Certainly, the appointment of General McKee will not suddenly transform our Government into one dominated by the military.

The military should never control our Government and the Congress should always be alert to prevent any such occurrence. The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is evidence of Congress' concern and provides a model procedure for the monitoring by the Congress of military participation in civilian government.

As I mentioned before, no military man can be appointed Administrator of the FAA without the specific approval of both Houses of the Congress. And, with respect to those military officers participating in the Agency, the Congress is furnished with a semianual report to advise it of the number, rank, and positions of those military personnel.

Of the three objections raised to the appointment of General McKee, only one is relevant—that he is a retired military officer and the act calls for a civilian. The other two objections—dual compensation and military domination—are peripheral matters which should be given separate consideration by the Congress.

The provision in this bill reiterating Congress' intent that civilians be appointed as Administrator of the FAA in the future and the continuing requirement of section 301(b) in the organic law to the same effect provide adequate assurance that there will be no military domination of the FAA.

I strongly urge the Senate to pass this bill so that the President can appoint General McKee as Administrator of the FAA and so that General McKee can assume this responsible position at the earliest possible time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I wish to make clear what the contemplation of the committee is with respect to the language in the bill excepting General McKee from the general operation of the law.

If the Senator from Oklahoma will look at the bill for a moment, on the first page of the bill it is provided:

> That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 301 (b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 * * *, or any other provision of law, the President, acting by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, is authorized to appoint General William F. McKee * * * to the office of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

My question is, Does the committee and does the bill contemplate that within the bill there is already given the advice and consent of the Senate, or is it contemplated that the nomination shall come before the Commerce Committee, where hearings may be had and a final recommendation made by the committee concerning whether the appointment shall be approved?

Mr. MONRONEY. I say without fear of contradiction that the President cannot appoint General McKee, subject to the advise and consent of the Senate, unless this exception to section 301(b) passes, because the law requires that at the time of appointment, the man named must be a civilian. Consequently, unless Congress enacts this bill, General McKee will not be eligible for Presidential appointment. Therefore, when he is eligible, if the requirement of the present law is waived by the passage of the bill, we shall start confirmation proceedings. He will then be subject to the usual Senate confirmation procedures.

As the distinguished chairman of the committee said, and as I said, the confirmation hearing will be held and all witnesses will be heard. The bill before us has nothing to do with confirmation. It precedes the confirmation that must take place.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my understanding that the committee, in recommending the bill, concludes that unless a bill of this character were passed, the President could not make the appointment or nomination.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Therefore, if the bill is passed, the appointment or nomination is to be made, if the President so determines, and then the natural course

of confirmation of the nomination by the Senate will follow.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I invite the Senator's attention to Mr. Macy's letter to the committee saying that he thought the bill was entirely consistent with the Dual Compensation Act. In his prepared testimony, found on pages 6 and 7 of the hearings, he likewise stated that, in his opinion, this particular bill is not inconsistent with the provisions of the Dual Compensation Act.

As I understand the Senator's statement made a moment ago in his speech, he concurs in that view.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is consistent with the Dual Compensation Act, but only if we make him eligible for nomination.

Mr. PEARSON. It may be a narrow point, but this is the point I sought to develop a few moments ago. When we debated the Dual Compensation Act, we could have searched into all aspects in an effort to learn whether we were going to range into complicated situations under the CAA and the Civil Aeronautics Board. But it would not apply, because civilians must be appointed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Only in the Federal Aviation Agency and some agencies in the Military Establishment, where the law prohibits military men; but in the rest of the Government the Dual Compensation Act applies to all military men. So we would prejudice General McKee if we do not enact this bill.

Mr. PEARSON. I may be in error, but I wish to make the point that two questions are involved. One is the question of civilian control of a civilian agency and the application to the nominee of the Dual Compensation Act. We will, however, let the latter point go.

Now I come to my last question. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma can answer it better than anybody else can. What is and what has been the traditional function of the Federal Aviation Agency since reorganization?

Mr. MONRONEY. It has been to promote safety on our airways, to provide fair aeronautical standards for pilots and others, to certificate all new equipment, to maintain airway navigational aids, to give flight tests for pilots, and to provide aid for airports. There is a multilateral combination of dozens of jobs. That is why we need someone with the broad general administrative experience of General McKee to be able to wear all the hats that are necessary to be worn by the Administrator of the Agency.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it not true that one of the managerial and organization abilities needed for this particular job is in connection with doing research for a supersonic transport?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is one of the big reasons for it. All who were considered, with the possible exception of Mr. Halaby, seemed to lack those qualifications. Mr. McNamara had to be almost drafted, because there was no competent person with this knowledge in FAA.

Mr. PEARSON. Has the Federal Aviation Agency ever before entered into research and development work for an airplane?

Mr. MONRONEY. It has not.

Mr. PEARSON. This is the first time we have done it?

Mr. MONRONEY. We have not done it yet. The Agency is merely conducting engineering studies to determine whether it should. We are fortunate to have a man who can advise us; who has had experience with military procurement on a large scale, so we will know the processes involved.

Mr. PEARSON. But if we spend $2 billion and make a decision to build a supersonic transport, the Federal Aviation Agency is the Agency that will do it?

Mr. MONRONEY. It will have something to do with it. A separate agency may do it. It may be the military. It is unsettled at this time. We still have much study and much research to do on it.

Mr. PEARSON. But that was the Senator's argument——

Mr. MONRONEY. I did not say this is the reason. I said this is one of the reasons why it would be well to have a man of his competence in this particular field. Among the applicants many men were considered along with General McKee. If we are going to study this question, we should have someone of competence to help guide the Agency.

Mr. PEARSON. Am I to understand that we need this very man to fill the bill to undergo a job we may or may not do?

Mr. MONRONEY. This is only one factor. He has wide experience and can give advice based on the many years he has spent in civilian and general affairs of the Air Force. He is one of the great administrators of the present day. This is a many-sided administrative job.

Mr. PEARSON. Is the Senator concerned, when the general is an authority in aviation, about the fact that the Federal Aviation Agency is going to go into this question and direct attention to basic research and development of such an airplane?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is a basic requirement for FAA certification of new aircraft, whether built by private industry or by the Government. However built, it is the FAA's job to certificate whatever planes are manufactured, whether new subsonic aircraft, or supersonic planes. This is a many-sided job which the Administrator must perform. If we go forward with the SST, we must have someone, at least, who is competent in procurement.

Mr. PEARSON. Let me say to the Senator from Oklahoma that I share his views, that NASA is, with all the money appropriated to it, spending 1 or 2 percent in the general aviation field; is that not correct?

Mr. MONRONEY. They are spending 1.5 percent of their $5.190 billion budget on aeronautics.

Mr. PEARSON. The Senator from Oklahoma has been critical of that.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; I have been critical of it.

Mr. PEARSON. I wish the Senator from Oklahoma to know that I share that view. I believe that development of the supersonic transport, if we do it properly, belongs to NASA. I have heard the Senator express the same view.

Mr. MONRONEY. I believe that basic research belongs in NASA. The management of a program and supervision of manufacturers and things that require that kind of experience belong with the FAA—if we had confidence in FAA to do it.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the Senator from Kansas very much for his comments.

Mr. President, in closing, I recognize the ever-present need to be mindful of maintaining military officers, retired or otherwise, in positions that would threaten civilian control of the Government. I believe that we have been blessed throughout our history with many great men, such as General Marshall, General Bradley, General Taylor and others, who have been able to render exceptional and extraordinary public service during critical moments in our history when that public service was needed.

I feel that Congress, having the ability to make judgments, should not be frightened or stampeded by anyone into becoming fearful that these men would suddenly abandon their traditional role as servants of a civilian government and attempt to be masters of a civilian government.

Those men are patriotic. They have largely directed our astronauts in their planning and historic flights. These are the men who today marshal our forces in far off Vietnam, waiting for the command of the civilian government on what to do, who guard our far-flung outposts against the Iron Curtain, who maintain communications to the South Pole. These are the men who have become examples of competence which should not be wasted.

I, for one, am not fearful of this kind of man trying to conspire to take over my Government, or to lessen in any degree the civilian control which the Constitution was designed to preserve.

Mr. President, this country has a great military system. It has great military leaders. No one that I know of in this system is attempting to monopolize civilian positions, or to seek control over civilian leaders for the benefit of the military.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I wish to open my remarks by endorsing the closing statement of the Senator from Oklahoma; namely, that we do not wish the military to take charge of the Government. We endorse the fundamental philosophy behind the bill, that this agency should be headed by a civilian, but we are advocating an exception that proves the rule; namely, that the best interests of the Nation should always come first. If the President has selected the best qualified man that any of us at this time know about for this

position to head the agency, the President should not be prohibited from appointing a military man merely because of the general rule.

Mr. President, when we talk about a military man, most of us think in terms of combat leaders.

In World War II, when we think about a real military leader we think of George Patton. He would undoubtedly have become Chief of Staff, had he lived. We also think of Curtis LeMay. He did become Chief of Staff. They are typical kinds of supreme combat leaders. However, our military agencies have become so expanded and so involved in this technical age that they now must have the kind of men who are technical. They must have men with an expanded organization who demonstrate great ability as administrators.

If General McKee has any enemies at all—and I have known him for a long time and he is a wonderfully fine man, and a wonderfully able man—they are limited to those he made when he showed efficiency in the administration of the Air Force, as its second in command, *Vice Chief* of Staff, to cut down on civilian employment when he knew that the number of employees was in excess of the needs.

If General McKee had any enemies outside of those, I have never heard of them.

Let me emphasize the statement that my friend the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] made in presenting his case today:

> It is particularly important at this point in the development of the Agency that a man who has had extensive experience with research and development and procurement with respect to new aviation systems and new aircraft be in a position of responsibility during the development of this program. Such experience General McKee has had as commander and vice commander of the Air Materiel Command where he was concerned with research and development in new aircraft.

As I understand, that is the position of the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. For several years, he has been interested in supersonic speed in commercial aviation. He believes that the Government must give the aviation industry some help in exploration and development, and therefore he wishes a man with the requisite qualifications to head the Federal Aviation Agency.

General McKee did not seek this position. He could have obtained civilian employment which would have paid him two or three times as much money as this office will pay.

General McKee is a dedicated man. He wishes to serve his Nation further.

He first made a great sacrifice when he joined NASA at the request of the President, at a substantial cut in pay, and then gave up that job to take a different job with another agency; I ask the Senator from Oklahoma if that is not correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is true.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Therefore, Mr. President, this is an exception that proves the rule. We have been requested by the President to confirm his conclusions that General McKee is the best qualified man he could find for this particular office.

Fortunately, I have known General McKee's family for many years. His father is a distinguished doctor in southwest Virginia. He is well over 80 years old, but is still active in practice. He is a wonderful man.

General McKee has also other brothers, all doctors, and all very fine men.

General McKee has had an outstanding career. I do not know of any general who was in as many areas of combat or who has more medals than General McKee. I was at the White House when he received his last Distinguished Service Medal.

Therefore, Mr. President, I join those who represent the agencies vitally affected in saying that I hope the Senate will vote to permit the President to nominate General McKee, and then, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] has pointed out, we shall reach the point of confirming that nomination.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago a report was issued by the Committee on Commerce which said, in part, that there are "grave reservations concerning what appears to be an increasing tendency to fill civilian government positions with retired military personnel."

This was just one of the key points of the report on the bill now before us, S. 1900. I have not quoted from the minority report in which the Senator from Kansas and I recommended against passage, but from the majority report recommending passage.

The majority report contains such warnings as "substantial doubts" and "continued appointments of career officers could destroy the symbol of civilian government."

To what does all this refer?

Both majority and minority reports have stated that there are too many military officers being appointed to civilian positions in what should be a civilian government. This important issue has been raised in the consideration of S. 1900 because that is the heart of the bill.

S. 1900 has one immediate purpose—to clear the way for the appointment of Air Force Gen. William F. McKee, recently retired, as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. His combined retirement pay and salary as Administrator would, through the good graces of this legislation and the Dual Compensation Act, be nearly $39,000. More important, General McKee would be cleared for a position which, according to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, was to be filled by "a civilian in the strictest sense of the word." I am speaking about the report when the act was enacted in 1958.

The majority of the Commerce Committee has stated, in effect, "We do not endorse the dangerous principle and precedent to be set by S. 1900, but we recommend laying aside principle this time in order to allow General McKee to be appointed."

I ask whether there does not seem to be a blush of guilt in the majority report.

There is, in fact, no difference on principle between the majority and we of the minority who oppose enactment of S. 1900. The only difference is whether this principle—that of the absolute need for a civilian head of the second largest civilian agency, the principle of civilian supremacy—should be set aside for General McKee.

I cling to the belief that one can never rise above principle. I am old fashioned enough to oppose casting aside principle for what seems to be a moment of expediency, especially when the consequences can be so devastating.

The committee majority has stated as reasons for passage of S. 1900 only that General McKee has a reputation for being a fine administrator and that the President strongly desires his appointment.

How many times this afternoon, from those who are supporting the bill, have we heard the words, "I know him personally. He is a fine gentleman"? I shall not question their interpretation of what they may think of General McKee. I do not know him. He has not been before the Commerce Committee. We who do not know him have not had any opportunity to question him, let alone to know what he believes.

Yet, a vital principle of our system of government is at stake—one which was clearly enunciated in the specific case of the FAA by Congress after conclusive hearings by Senators and Representatives, a majority of whom remain members of both the House and the Senate.

The principle simply stated is that civilian control of the military is a basic, necessary tenet of our unique American democracy.

The rich heritage of civilian supremacy is taught in all the textbooks of our schools. Shall we have the books rewritten?

By this action we contributed to the constant erosion that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] referred to in his questions to the Senator from Oklahoma; that this was not a one-time affair, but a continuing affair.

If we here decide that civilians no longer are capable of conducting the affairs of our Government and that the military is now the only segment of our society from which can come our leaders, the honest course is to say so frankly. Then the textbooks will be rewritten to reflect this new concept, which so many of us consider so dangerous and un-American.

Before doing so, let us remember that the wise concept of civilian pre-eminence dates back to colonial days, continuing unbroken to the present. By adhering to this principle, the United States has avoided the military cliques of Europe and the political upheaval of our Latin neighbors.

James Madison thought the regulation of the militia to be natural as a part of civil authority charged with the public defense.

> It did not seem—
>
> Said Madison—
>
> in its nature to be divisable between two distinct authorities. If the States would trust the general government with a power over the public treasury, they would from the same consideration by necessity grant it the direction of the public force. Those

who had a full view of the public situation would, from a sense of the danger, guard against it.

A few days later in the Federal Convention of 1787, Charles Pinckney elaborated on Madison's point, saying:

The military should always be subordinate to the civil power.

Thereafter, Pinckney burned the admonition into the Bill of Rights by stating that soldiers could not, in peacetime, be quartered in homes of civilians without their permission. Today we say that soldiers should not be quartered in the house of civil government.

Later, in his Farewell Address, President George Washington said:

Hence, likewise, they [the States] will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty.

The concern of possible military domination and the intense desire to keep the civilians in control of the military are burned into the pages of our history books from the days of the Colonies to our own.

On March 11, 1952, Look magazine published parallel articles by General of the Army Omar N. Bradley and Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas on the question of whether there was a danger of takeover by the military.

Mr. Justice Douglas stated, in part:

The increasing influence of the military in our thinking and in our affairs is the most ominous aspect of our modern history. Our Government was designed to keep the military in the background, reserving them for days of actual hostilities. We indeed do the military great disservice by thrusting civilian tasks upon them. * * * Many of them are the first to recognize that neither by training nor experience are they as a general rule qualified. * * *

My criticism runs to the military clique that spreads slowly throughout government, expanding its hold and making its voice more loudly heard with each passing day. * * * The military should, in no case, be called upon for action until the political department is bankrupt.

In his statement that American government has nothing to fear from the military, General Bradley—as the majority of the Commerce Committee did for the minority—made an excellent case for civilian control.

There is no military clique. * * * civilians are in charge—

Wrote General Bradley. He also said, in part:

All the military men I know believe profoundly in civilian control and look to civilian leadership in national and international affairs. * * * Economically, politically and militarily, the control of our country resides with the civilian executive and legislative agencies, and thus ultimately in the hands of the voters and organized civilian groups interested in good government.

Americans guide their Government, and their destiny, through their elected and appointed leaders. Fortunately—

And this is the crux of it—

there is no dearth of strong leadership in the United States. * * * When you have civilians like these in charge, no military clique can develop.

General Bradley has, thus, made a good case for us to keep the reins of agencies like the FAA in the hands of civilians.

President Dwight Eisenhower in his farewell address on January 17, 1961, stated:

In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties of the democratic process.

General of the Army Douglas MacArthur also recognized this inherent danger in speaking to the cadets at West Point on May 12, 1962. He said:

Others will debate the controversial issues, national and international, which divide men's minds. * * * Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of government. * * * These great national problems are not for your participation or military solution.

What has happened since these passionate warnings for the preservation of our system were given? Have the civilian arms of the Government kept rights control as General Bradley thought so certain?

We have, in the intervening years, become obsessed with the need for scientific knowledge. Science, especially in the aero-space field, has become all important. Gradually, slowly, but surely, the notion has become accepted that only the military can supply the scientific knowledge necessary for a scientific age.

The task of attracting retired career military men to civilian Government jobs has became too simple. The Dual Compensation Act of 1964 makes generous retirement benefits and civilian salaries both available to retired military people while denying similar treatment to civilians who may be called upon to serve the Government with special skills.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In my judgment, the more important issue is not civilian against military. We have a $26 million first-year cost toward developing a supersonic transport. If that transport is developed, under the man who is presently the Administrator, Mr. Halaby, who wants to retire and return to private industry, the agency will require that all the patents shall belong to the Government. In that way anyone who produces that transport will have to pay the Government $2 million. That is what the Government would receive on every transport sold. The Government would get back that $2 million per plane for development costs in connection with the supersonic transport.

It is proposed that we take this man from NASA and put him in charge of the Federal Aviation Agency. His present agency favors giving away private patents on Government research. Unless I miss my guess, that is something that he is doing where he is. It is my fear that he will do what the tycoons of the aircraft industry want; that he will give them private patents on Government research and overrule every little mechanic in the shop that he will be in. In that event, it will cost the taxpayers $26 million a year to get that fellow over in the Federal Aviation Agency.

That is a question upon which we may be compelled to vote. We shall determine whether $26 million annually will be given away by changing the patent policy. If the tycoons have their way they will not pay off $2 million per plane to help repay development cost. We will develop; they will take the development and obtain private patents. If we want those airplanes constructed under the private patents, the aircraft tycoons will receive $2 million per plane instead of the 198 million citizens of our country getting the $2 million. That is the problem. That is where the real bug under the chip is.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from Louisiana has put his finger on a very important point. We have not had an opportunity to examine this man. If we pass the bill, that action will be tantamount to approval of him. Everyone in this body knows that. The Senator from Kansas has joined me in the minority views. He understands the problem. When we pass the bill, it will be tantamount to approving the proposed nominee without having his name before us and without our having had an opportunity to examine him or even question him as to his ideas on civilian government, what his ideas on patents, and his ideas on supersonic transport, or anything else.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If General McKee is brought before a committee of the Senate and tells us that he will not change the patent policy of the FAA—and he may be the only man who wishes to change it, but he will be in charge up there—if he is brought in and convinces me that the proposal is not a $26 million steal, I shall vote for the bill, but under no other conditions will I do so.

Mr. HARTKE. There is only one way in which that can be done and that is what I intend to do. At the proper time I intend to move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce for further hearings. We cannot bring to the floor of the Senate a witness. We can only do that in the Commerce Committee. The only way we can do it is to commit the bill to the Commerce Committee so that we can ask him the questions which the Senator has suggested and some other questions which I shall raise later in my speech. We shall go through the whole thing and do it right now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we are to pass the bill, the first thing we ought to do is to amend it in order to give $9,000 a year to Najeeb Halaby. Everyone agrees that he is qualified. He has said that it cost him money to be the head of the Agency. He wishes to return to private industry. He has been protecting the public interest. He is against giving away $26 million to private contractors on the proposed contract. The first thing we ought to do is to give Mr. Halaby the $9,000 of which he has been

deprived if General McKee is going to get $9,000 more.

The second thing that we must determine is whether we are about to give away $26 million.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is exactly correct. There is no other way to do that except under the procedure which I have suggested, and that is to commit the bill to the Committee on Commerce in order that we might have an opportunity to vote on the question there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been importuned on the question. The administration could have had my vote at any time it wanted if it had sent General McKee down here and he would say that he would not do with the bill what I fear he will do; that is, reverse the patent policy of that Agency, which policy happens to be about the best in the whole Government.

At one time a group came and testified before my little Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly. The members of that group made magnificent statements as to how they were protecting the public interest. They do the research, and if they find something good, they take a patent for the Government. Then, if anyone wishes to use it, a fee is charged the user, and they get money back to help pay the cost of the research.

Mr. HARTKE. The money is returned to the Federal Treasury?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To the Federal Treasury.

Mr. HARTKE. For the benefit of the taxpayers.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For the taxpayers' benefit. A similar policy was followed by the British Government with regard to the development of the Vickers Viscount, which at that time was a very fine airplane. The royalties which that government received from the users of the Vickers Viscount paid for the research.

We are spending $15 billion a year in research and getting back zero except for that one agency. The tycoons want to change that policy, Senator. They want to change it. They may feel that General McKee is the man who will reverse it.

I fear they may have the man who will do so. I should like to know if that is what the deal is, and if that is the deal, I am against the man having the job.

Mr. HARTKE. There is no way to find out what the deal is. I have never met the gentleman about whom we are speaking. I have never seen him. I know nothing about him except what I have heard about him. This afternoon we have heard his supporters say that he is a fine gentleman. I do not know what that stands for. I do not know where he stands on patent rights. There is only one way to find out. If the bill is recommitted to the Committee on Commerce, we can go into the question. We can bring that gentleman before the committee before the bill is finally acted upon and we can see exactly the type of man upon whom we are asked to pass judgment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would it not be worth asking the proposed nominee what he would propose to do with the results of Government research? Does he propose to give them away the way he is giving them away in the place he is now, or does he propose to protect the public and continue the policy of the agency where he proposes to go?

Mr. HARTKE. I should like to say to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is our assistant majority leader, that if the bill is recommitted to the committee, I promise that I shall not only ask the questions to which he has referred, but I shall also go into many other questions which I should like to ask in depth.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I cannot vote for that man without knowing the answer to that question.

Mr. HARTKE. I appreciate the Senator's position. I want the Senator to know that I cannot do so either. I could not do so in good conscience. I do not mind telling the Senator from Louisiana that I thought at one time I would have to stand alone. Then the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] joined me. I believe that a few additional Senators will join us this afternoon.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the Senator from Louisiana made his original speech on the subject, there was only one other Senator on the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct. That was the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. He convinced that Senator; so he won 100 percent of his audience. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARTKE. I know the great interest of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana in looking out for the benefit of the American people. He looks out for the fiscal responsibility of the United States. He looks out for the American taxpayers' dollar. That is what the Senator is doing. I assure the Senator that if we can have the bill recommitted to the committee, we could ask the questions which should be asked. The Senator from Rhode Island was here and spoke. He has questions that he would like to ask. He indicated that he wanted the issue reviewed. If he votes the way he talked, perhaps we shall be successful on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Indiana has done our Nation a service. He has not been a rubberstamp.

The present President of the United States, at the rate he is going, will be the greatest President in the history of our country. If he can keep it up, and if the good Lord gives him some breaks he will wind up being the greatest President in history, not even excluding George Washington. [Laughter.]

But we too have a responsibility. We are paid to represent the people of this country. We are supposed to think and do something once in awhile. We are supposed to look at these bills and decide whether we think they are good or bad, and not merely rubberstamp measures sent to us, and send them back to the White House. If that is all we do, we are unnecessary. In that event our office ought to be abolished, and the White House ought to be allowed to run the whole thing, eliminating the restraints, impediments, and delays that the Congress might impose upon the executive branch.

Mr. HARTKE. This much is true. I have the utmost respect for our President. I have been called at home. I am a Johnson supporter. The Senator knows that, as everyone else does. I admire the President. I respect him. I think he is a great President. It is not a question of opposing the President. Yet if that problem should arise, and we thought that the measure was unwise, this body should overwhelmingly vote against the bill.

If Senators will read the committee report, they will observe that the only statement of the majority in favor of the bill is the President's letter. There is not a single other word of support in the report. If the proponents of the measure had an argument to present, why did they not do so? They went backward and forward through the explanation, and at the end of the report the majority did not even say "We recommend passage of the bill." They ended up on a note of fear about the military. They ended up with a bunch of reports and tables showing how many retired officers in the military there are, showing that there has been a steady erosion, and showing an analysis of how many people in the FAA are now on retired military status. All those things should be in the minority views. I am glad that the majority put them in for it is a very persuasive argument for the minority.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana has spoken about Mr. Halaby receiving $9,000. In the Finance Committee we are about to complete consideration of the social security bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does it not seem to the Senator that if one man saves money for the taxpayers and protects the taxpayers' interest, he ought to be paid more than the man who would give away our money?

Mr. HARTKE. Perhaps we should offer an amendment to the bill to provide a $9,000 subsidy for Mr. Halaby as a going-away present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. No one says that Halaby is not qualified. Halaby has been qualified to do this job. He tried to protect the public interest. How do we explain a situation in which it is proposed to hire someone to replace him and pay more than Halaby was paid?

Mr. HARTKE. I am sorry; I cannot answer the Senator's question. The Senator from Louisiana knows I cannot answer it. Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma can answer it.

Under the social security bill the Senate will soon consider a provision for certain increases in the amount a man drawing social security can earn. He will be able to come back to the Federal Government and take a position in which he can earn $1,500 and can then keep half of his next $1,500. But if he

earns more than $2,250, he will have to give the whole amount back. He cannot keep his retirement benefits even though he has contributed throughout his career to the retirement fund. It is not like the position of a man in the Army, who makes no contribution to his retirement; it is paid entirely out of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Do I correctly understand that the average rank-and-file workingman will have to give up his social security pension because he is making some money on the side?

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would not this be a special law to provide that an Army officer who has lived all his life on the backs of the taxpayers, and who has not been required to contribute to his retirement, will be able to keep his pension and still receive his Army pay?

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct. That is the very point raised by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE]. In other words, the same question is involved. It is all taxpayers' money. When an Army man retires, he takes his money out of the taxpayers' fund. But under social security the person makes a contribution. He is the poor workingman, whom we are always looking out for so carefully. I think his is being mistreated in this regard, but we cannot convince the majority of the committee. But I shall continue to try.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Indiana has continued to insist on an amendment to provide that after age 65 a person can retain his social security benefits while still earning a few dollars. The name of the Senator from Indiana is HARTKE.

What the Senator from Indiana is saying is that if it is a good idea for General McKee, it ought to be a good idea for the 18 million old folks who want to earn a few dollars to supplement their social security checks.

Mr. HARTKE. Citizens of the United States ought to be entitled to receive their retirement pay from their Government. Whether retired Government employee or ordinary citizen on social security, those other than the military career men must make sacrifices to work for the Government.

Small wonder that the Civil Service Commission now places the number of retired military personnel working for the civilian government at 30,000. I am told that some 9,000 employees of the Federal Aviation Agency have some military status. Ninety-four high-ranking officers on active duty in the military serve in top FAA positions.

The American people share my concern at this dangerous trend. Testimony to this fact lies in the wide acceptance and popularity of diverse works—serious and satirical—in the field: "Seven Days in May," "Failsafe, Kill, and Overkill," and "Dr. Strangelove."

Albert Einstein, perhaps the most brilliant man of our age, wrote in "The American Scholar" in the summer issue, 1947, an article on "The Military Mentality." He said:

> It is characteristic of the military mentality that nonhuman factors (atom bombs, strategic bases, weapons of all sorts, possession of raw materials, etc.) are held essential, while the human being, his desires and thoughts—in short, the psychological factors—are considered unimportant and secondary. * * * The individual is degraded to a mere instrument; he becomes "human material." The normal ends of human aspiration vanish with such a viewpoint. Instead, the military mentality raises "naked power" as a goal in itself—one of the strangest illusions to which men can succumb.
>
> In our time the military mentality is still more dangerous than formerly because the offensive weapons have become much more powerful than the defensive ones. Therefore it leads, by necessity, to preventive war. The general insecurity that goes hand in hand with this results in the sacrifice of the citizen's civil rights to the supposed welfare of the state.

This comes, of course, from the man whose scientific genius led to development of the atomic bomb. No wonder, in our system, the trigger for this terrible weapon of destruction lies within the grasp of the President alone, again pointing up the desperate need for wise civilian control clearly recognized at every stage of our existence as a nation.

Such control within the Federal Aviation Agency was clearly spelled out when it was created in 1958. Congress took unusual steps to insure civilian control because the FAA was empowered to certify aircraft, promote air safety, build and maintain airports, arbitrate differences between civilian and military air needs, and hold total control over the airways.

I was delighted to hear the Senator from Oklahoma say that there has been a situation in which the military refused to tell anyone where it flew its planes. I do not know whether the situation has changed so much since 1958 that the military will not absolutely run over the civilian authority.

Mr. President, there is no solid testimony in the hearings in connection with General McKee. The National Pilots Association is opposed to the bill. Talk about lobbies; it is not the military lobbies that are against this man.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The bill, if it should pass would provide benefits for one man, would it not?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It would provide a job for one man.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is exactly correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Has the committee had this one man before it?

Mr. HARTKE. No; he has not been before the committee. I would not know him if he walked through the door. I do not know whether he is a short man or a tall man, whether he is heavy or slim. I do not know how many medals he has. Someone said he has a number of medals. That is fine. It is fine for military men to have medals. It is fine for military men to be in charge of the Air Force.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. To pass the bill would be tantamount to voting the man into the job, would it not?

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator could not be more correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is too bad that more Senators were not present to hear the Senator's speech the other night. It is too bad that I was the only one to hear the Senator's first speech.

Mr. HARTKE. It was late in the evening.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If we are expected to pass the bill, we ought to take a look at the man. We have no business giving the man the job without looking at him.

Everything I have heard about him is good. He has been recommended by some fine people. The President and a number of Senators approve him for the position. That is all to the good. But we are entitled to know the answers to a few questions.

For example, I want to know whether he is going to change the patent policy and give away private patents on $26 million a year of research and development money.

Mr. HARTKE. I cannot tell the Senator what the answer to that question will be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are not supposed to find out, are we?

Mr. HARTKE. No; we are supposed to pass judgment on the question because a few Senators know him personally. I know of no opposition. Perhaps he is the personal preference of some Senators. Perhaps some Senators recommended him. Did the Senator from Louisiana have an opportunity to recommend anyone for the position?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If that man intends to change the patent policy, the Senate can get ready for a determined fight, so far as I am concerned, when his name is submitted. In my judgment, it would be an outrage to change the patent policy of FAA. This could, in effect, change the patent laws merely by appointing a man who would change the policy of the Federal Aviation Administration. Many people feel that that would be evil.

I want to know whether that is what is going to happen. Some tycoons want to rob the taxpayers. I am against that.

Mr. HARTKE. The passage of the bill would be tantamount to promoting the man to this position. If the Senate votes to recommit the bill to the Committee on Commerce to hold hearings, we shall then have a chance to be fair, not alone to the Senate, but to General McKee, as well. He has not yet had an opportunity to state his position. Perhaps he would say to the Senator from Louisiana, "I absolutely am opposed to changing the patent policy. I opposed it in NASA." I do not know whether he did or not. Perhaps he is in charge of it. Perhaps he has stated it there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have before me a copy of the hearings on the bill. They consist of 25 pages.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator know the number of people who testified?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. General McKee himself never showed up.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why was he not present?

Mr. HARTKE. I presume that he was not asked to be present. Mr. Macy testified on his behalf.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is proposed to be done by circumstantial evidence. We are being told that this man is fantastic, that he is wonderful, that he is great. We are being told that no one else in America could do it, that he is the only man who could do the job. Having been told that, we are to be deprived of the privilege of even seeing the man.

Mr. HARTKE. The indispensable theory applies here if it applies anywhere under the sun. This man under this bill is regarded as an indispensable man. He is regarded as being the only qualified man for this post out of 200 million people. We are, in effect, being told that only the military personnel could offer such a man. We are being told that no institution, MIT, Purdue University, or any other institution can supply such a man. We are being told that our entire education system is so sadly neglected today that the system is not capable of producing one man of civilian rank who could be nominated for this position.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I once served on the Armed Services Committee. I was the chairman of an important subcommittee at one time. I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations and still do.

This man reportedly has been an important member of our armed services during the time that I was a member of these committees. But, I never heard of him.

If we are to pass a law to provide that this is the only man who could do the job, I should like to see him. Perhaps I have met him. I do not recall him.

Mr. HARTKE. There is only one way in which to do it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator know the man?

Mr. HARTKE. I would not know the man. Personally, I know nothing good or bad about him. We have received several letters which are not too complimentary.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I hope that the Senator would not have those printed in the RECORD. I hope that the Senator would see fit to handle this matter in another fashion.

I hope that we shall be given the opportunity to see the man for whom we are being asked to pass the law. We should ask him a question or two. Perhaps what the Senator has heard about the man might be erroneous. Perhaps he could explain it.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Why should we be denied the privilege of seeing this gentleman?

Mr. HARTKE. I do not know. That is the mystery of the age.

The National Pilots Association in its testimony on this matter opposed the principle. It opposed the bill. Others did the same.

John Macy testified in support of it. We have the statement of Joseph B. Hartranft, Jr., president of the Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association.

I think he pulled the neatest double trick that has ever been performed when, after having testified in opposition to the matter, he changed his position when someone got in touch with him and put a little heat under him, and said, "He will be the Administrator of the FAA. You will be in trouble." He then came back and said:

> We must conclude that the present language is either inadequate to convey accurately and convincingly the intent of Congress with regard to statutory qualifications of candidates, or that there exists nowhere an available and capable civilian to fill this top aviation post.

Then this remarkable statement was made by a man who was giving tacit agreement, after he had once issued a statement in opposition:

> We cannot conceive that the latter could be the same—that nowhere within the FAA itself or from outside that Agency does there exist a qualified civilian.
>
> The issue of civilian leadership, we conclude, must be drawn with renewed clarity. * * *

He then stated that he wanted some amendments to the bill and everything else. The truth is that there is no support for this measure whatever.

As the Senator from Louisiana has said, the Senate is entitled to know General McKee's views of the problems of aviation, and especially civilian aviation. We must know his feelings on the delicate and important relationships between military and civilian aviation. We must know what he is going to do in the field of Government patents.

Since S. 1900 has been reported to the Senate, considerable interest has been shown in the principle involved as well as in General McKee himself. I have a copy of a letter written to the junior Senator from Ohio, who has joined me in this fight for civilian control. It comes from a leader of civilian employees at an Air Force installation. I shall read part of the letter without stating the writer's name.

The letter reads:

> I heartily commend you for the position you have taken in regard to the appointment of Gen. "Bozo" McKee (retired, thank goodness).
>
> I, along with hundreds—and I suspect thousands—of Air Force base employees have nothing but contempt for a man of his caliber who had nothing but contempt for civilian employees, and who on his own, instituted several RIF's (reductions in force) in order to show enormous savings to the Air Force and to further his promotion to the four-star rank.
>
> He now feels he should have a civilian position.
>
> There are many of the same type of retired officers now employed at ——— AFB who have been forced out of the Air Force (not qualified for retention) and who by hook or crook have been appointed to civilian positions. They now have military retired pay, the medical benefits (free), the commissary and PX privileges, and the civilian pay looks good to them and they still try to walk over their civilian counterparts. Lord help the civilians if this is allowed to continue. Don't back down on McKee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I note that this letter comes from an Ohioan who is a leader of civilian employees.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I see a copy of the letter in order that I may learn just what his position of leadership is? I ask that because his only complaint is that General McKee reduced the number of employees, the charge being that he made the reduction in order to obtain a four-star generalship. No explanation is given. Perhaps he made the reduction because the employees were not needed. The charge is made that this was the method of becoming a four-star general. I cannot believe that. Who is the man? What is his leadership? What is the association with which he is connected?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I state to my distinguished colleague from Ohio, the senior Senator from Ohio, and also to my colleague, the Senator from Indiana—whom I support in his position in this matter—that there has been talk about lobbying here today. The only real lobbying that has been done has been by those on the other side who wish me to change my views and to vote in support of General McKee.

I have received a number of letters from the Dayton area. Those letters have been answered. My staff is now obtaining the letters that I have received.

I received letters which expressed sentiment against General McKee from Dayton and one other area in Ohio. I received a letter or two which spoke very highly of him. The letters were not persuasive with me.

I have made up my mind on other grounds altogether. However, I shall be glad to show those letters to the Senator. The letters are not in any particular file. They were answered by me in a routine manner. The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] who is sitting beside me saw some of those letters.

I permitted the Senator from Indiana to make copies of them. I shall show the originals of the letters to my colleague. As I recall, one or two of those letters came from members of some labor union in the Dayton area.

They were not persuasive in causing me to change my views whatever. My view is very firm that this is a bad appointment because we in this Nation want civilian authority to be always supreme over military authority. The Founding Fathers, the men who were the architects of our Constitution—whom we call the Founding Fathers—established that principle.

Our great President, Harry S. Truman, demonstrated that principle when he dismissed General MacArthur. I think that under the circumstances he rendered a public service in doing so. I feel today that if we uphold the Senator from Indiana and the measure is recommitted for hearings, we shall be rendering a service to the citizens of the Nation.

I have made one inquiry on this matter. I find that if General McKee is

appointed to this position, his adjusted retirement salary with his salary in this office would be the highest that is paid to an official of the executive or legislative branches of the Government, next only to the President and Vice President of the United States. I do not like that sort of business.

It seems to me that this administration is becoming topheavy with generals. There are too many generals and ex-generals occupying civilian positions that should be occupied by civilians.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I take it that what my colleague has said in answer to the question is that the letter which was quoted by the Senator from Indiana stated that the labor leader said McKee reduced the number of employees to obtain a four-star generalship. I do not believe that. I know about the reduction in employees. I tried to find out. The fact is that there were too many employees, and General McKee had the courage to say that there were men working there who were not needed. That is the source of the opposition.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I agreed to yield first to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have recognition to call up a conference report on H.R. 8371——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to take up the conference report on H.R. 8371.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. MANSFIELD. I realize that this matter has priority, but I think, in good faith, if we cannot complete the pending business I am honor bound to call certain Members who said they wanted to be called when the conference report was called up.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Call them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us finish this.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A Senator has a right to call up a conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us finish the bill first.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider the conference report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor. The Senator from Indiana has the floor now, and he cannot be taken off the floor.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HARTKE. If I should make a motion to recommit, would it be debatable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HARTKE. I move to recommit the measure to the Commerce Committee, and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The years and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A parliamentary inquiry is out of order during a quorum call.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Do I not have a right to ask what we are voting on?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order while a quorum call is proceeding.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is it a quorum call that is proceeding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a quorum call that is in progress.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi had requested the floor before the conference report came up, and I yield to him.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Does the Senator from Indiana have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. I yield further to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me, and I shall be brief.

I am sure the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Louisiana in their remarks regarding General McKee—

Mr. President, may this walking through here cease, and may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. STENNIS. I am sure the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Louisiana were doing nothing more than what they thought was clearly their duty in their references to General McKee. I do not know what the RECORD will show or whether the reporter has every word or not, but there is no question in my mind that the substance of what they said was to belittle and ridicule and discredit, to a degree, the career of a very fine American whom I barely know personally.

No one has asked me to say anything about the pending matter or asked for my vote, but I hope I shall not stay here long enough to hear a man of this character and kind attacked on the floor of the Senate without trying to respond to such charges.

Moreover, there was applause from the galleries and hilarity and jubilation over the Senators' exchange in their debate. There was applause in the galleries. Something that was said was amusing to them. There was no reprimand by the Presiding Officer. I do not refer specifically to the Presiding Officer in the chair, but no reprimand was made.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I have a brief statement to make.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is reflecting on me.

Mr. STENNIS. I am not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Mississippi is saying the Senator from Louisiana impugned this man's honor. What did I say——

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to make my statement. I will yield later. I cannot sit here and hear a man discredited in that way if I believed that distinguished Senators said what they did not know.

I know the man. I know him in an official capacity. He is not a friend of mine. He has never done anything for me. He always refused to do what I asked him to do. I have not done anything for him. I do not expect to. But, as for the kind of man he is, he retired not long ago and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] had this to say about him; and he is a Senator who knows.

I skip the initial paragraphs:

> The value of his services and the esteem in which General McKee is held by the Government are made manifest by the fact that he is retired as the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff.
>
> His capabilities were recognized years ago when, in 1942, he was chosen among the qualified eight officers by General H. H. "Hap" Arnold requested for staff duty at headquarters of the Army Air Forces.

That is what the Senator from Virginia said about General McKee.

I also have another tribute from the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], which I shall not take the time to read.

My association with General McKee has been solely of an official nature. I know him to be one of the finest men of integrity and honor whom I have ever known. He is independent to the *n*th degree. I do not see how he ever rose to become a four-star general with the independence and the frankness which he possesses.

I understand that the great General LeMay—and I seldom use that word "great"—called him into his office after General LeMay became Chief of Staff of the Air Force and said, "How would you like to be Vice Chief of Staff?" General McKee responded in no uncertain manner and General LeMay said, "You are 'it' now. Go to work."

Mr. President, I recite that incident to show what General LeMay thought of General McKee. He was the personal choice of General LeMay.

Let me say to all Senators now in the Chamber that I know it is against our nature to attack someone, but the substance of what was said was to discredit this man and his record.

I am sure that General McKee does not care one whit whether he is chosen

for this position or not, but the President has chosen him, and if he is selected he will be an outstanding Administrator, regardless of his background, military or not military. I have no doubt about that. General McKee is an exception in my own thinking, and I am going to support the bill.

I was here when we enacted the law that changed the provisions which made George Catlett Marshall eligible to be Secretary of Defense. No one ever regretted that.

I was here when they changed the law when we made General Quesada, at General Eisenhower's suggestion, as I recall, Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

I do not believe that we can find a more outstanding man of higher integrity, or a greater Administrator of more exceptional talent and the very highest possible patriotism than this man, General McKee, about whom I speak.

Mr. President, I close on the same note with which I opened, that I doubt whether Senators realize the extent to which a general impression once created can lead their hearers into applause from the galleries.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana to reply to the Senator from Mississippi, because this is in the nature of personal privilege.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, there is no man I love and admire more in this body than the Senator from Mississippi. Any man who would come to the Senate and request the desk of Jefferson Davis and insist on continuing possession of that desk as long as he serves in the Senate would have my affection, if for that act alone.

In addition to the fact that it was my pleasure to serve with him on the Rules Committee and on the Armed Services Committee, I have always looked upon the distinguished Senator as one of the great statesmen of this body. That is how I feel, even when he is defeating me on something on which we cannot agree. It will always be that way.

What I said in the Chamber was to the effect that to enact the bill would be tantamount to confirming General McKee in this position.

However, I do not wish the nomination of that man to be confirmed unless I know the answers to certain questions. If he will answer those questions the right way, I shall vote for him. If he answers the wrong way, I shall fight him so long as I have the power to fight him. The issue is that simple.

Therefore, if Senators have not learned by now that the junior Senator from Louisiana feels that to give away a patent on Government research is an outrage, then Senators should spend more time on the Senate floor. I have been saying that in speech after speech after speech. It has gotten to the point where one of our great Americans told me, "Do not discuss it. I have heard it so many times. I do not want to hear any more about it."

Perhaps I am a zealot when I discuss that particular issue. I wish to know how the man we are talking about today stands on this issue, because if he is going to give away patents on Government research, I will oppose him with all the strength at my command.

It may be that he will answer the question the way I would like to have it answered. If he does, fine. I would vote for him. It is that simple. Perhaps I have tunnel vision, and see only one issue. But, to me, it is very important.

Now, with all due deference, we have heard talk about reflecting on someone. I hope Senators have heard the rumor, the mouth-to-mouth things which are being said behind the scenes as to the intentions of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], that he is not really sincere, that he is prejudiced, that he is being unreasonable and unfair.

Mr. President, I have heard the Senator's speech. I was about the only Senator to hear his first speech. It was one of the most convincing speeches I have heard in the entire session of Congress. We heard talk about being unfair to someone. Most Senators were not even present in the Chamber when the Senator made a speech on which he has worked for months. Senators did not come into the Chamber to hear him, but he made a fine speech that demonstrated weeks of thorough preparation. He has discussed information provided to him and, although someone can take offense at it, what he has said does not violate one whit the rules of the Senate.

A Senator may rise on the floor and say, "The President is a crook," and no one can do a thing about it, except that Senators can get up and denounce him for doing it.

The Senator from Indiana has made a magnificent speech on this subject. Behind the scenes, someone says, "You know, HARTKE is not really against General McKee. He is sore because of a plane crash, or because "Quesada would not do what HARTKE thought Quesada should do several years ago. It is the Senator from Indiana who has a right to be resentful. But listen to the Senator's speeches. I challenge anyone not to hear them and say that he makes magnificent speeches on this subject. The speeches do credit to him as a Senator, and they do credit to the Senate. The Senator read from a letter which apparently could have been said to come from a "sorehead." I have been in committee when a crank testified against a man nominated for a particular job. What did the committee do? We said to the nominee, "What is your reaction to that?"

The nominee answered it. He explained it, and inasmuch as we thought it was correct, that was all there was to it. We did not bother to quarrel with the accuser for his view, we simply ignored it.

Let me say to the Senator from Indiana that what he is talking about is relevant. He has a right to say it. This is something I would like to look into. It is interesting. If the individual who wrote the letter is a labor leader, that does not make him a crook. One might say, "This is what he said. General McKee, what is your response to this?" It might be that General McKee could answer it correctly. Let me also say to the Senator that there is nothing particularly unusual about someone saying something which the galleries find amusing. It has happened many times in this Chamber.

Is someone to go to jail because of someone laughing at something he said?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). The Senator from Indiana is recognized.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] that I yielded the floor graciously, and as soon as I could. The only reason I held up and asked for a quorum call was in deference to the majority leader in trying to work out the matter of a conference report.

When I yielded the floor to the Senator from Mississippi, I did not know what he wished to do. I did know that he was irritated at what I had said.

I am surprised that the Senator from Mississippi would believe that one ridicules a man when he says he does not know him. It must have hit a sensitive nerve somewhere on his part to say that it is ridiculous when one says he does not know a man. That is the first time I have heard that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me say, so far as I am concerned, that no one did anything wrong. I wish to make that clear.

Mr. HARTKE. Let us proceed, then, with debate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is a good idea. I believe that the Senator from Indiana has an excellent idea. I believe that it would do us all a great deal of good if we proceeded with debate and decide this issue one way or the other as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], who wishes to make a statement on this issue.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana if his position is not substantially that there is a law on the books regarding the eligibility and the conditions under which anyone can be appointed to serve on this agency.

Mr. HARTKE. That is the law of 1958, establishing the Federal Aviation Agency.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it not the position of the Senator from Indiana that the proper way to approach this question would be to repeal the law, and that if the law is wrong, it ought not to be respected?

Mr. HARTKE. That is what I have said numerous times. If we do not like the law, we should repeal it. We should not go about in this fashion.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the objection of the Senator from Indiana twofold? Is it not, in the first place, that the Senator feels that the policy of providing for civilian control of this commission is a wise policy?

Mr. HARTKE. It is a very wise policy, as has been proved throughout our history.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not the second position of the Senator from Indiana that if we are to have a law on this subject, such as we have, that law ought to apply not only to General McKee, but also to the other people, and equally throughout the Nation?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes; equal application of the law is a sound principle, upon which we should all agree.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from Indiana may accept my assurance that although I entertain the very highest opinion of General McKee, I shall vote with the Senator from Indiana because, if we are not going to observe the law in all cases, we ought to change the law. I shall vote with him because I believe that a law that is enacted to apply to 190 million people should apply to all of them, not to 189,999,999.

Mr. HARTKE. The Senator from North Carolina is 100 percent correct. I thank him for his support.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, it seems to me that discussing General McKee's character is not in order at this time. We are not considering his nomination for any position. He has not been nominated for any position.

Mr. HARTKE. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. If the pending bill is passed, if he is nominated for any position, we shall have plenty of time to discuss his qualifications for the job.

It seems to me we are considering now whether we should offer a substantial incentive for our capable military officers to retire at the earliest possible moment to accept another job with Government, with a big salary added; or encourage our military personnel to retire as early as possible to accept higher paid jobs in private industry. Many of them do.

I can think of instances in which very capable officers have been literally fired at the first chance by a superior, to get rid of them, when they wanted to stay on and finish their career with the Government and give the best that they had to give to the Government.

I shall vote with the Senator from Indiana. If and when General McKee's nomination comes before the Senate, I shall try to listen fairly to the arguments for and against, and vote accordingly.

Mr. HARTKE. I know of no fairer statement that could be made than the statement of the Senator from Vermont. I thank him for his support. I now yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall vote against the pending bill. I shall vote for recommittal. I shall vote against tabling. I shall do so not because I share the fears of the Senator from Indiana, but, rather, because I do not believe General McKee possesses such rare and exclusive qualifications as to warrant this special favoritism legislation.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator for her support, although it is based on a different principle than mine.

I now yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have listened for several hours to the discussion, as many other Senators have also.

Let me make clear that I am willing to assume that General McKee is an extraordinarily capable prson. I am certain that the chairman of the Aviation Subcommitte, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], correctly described him when he said General McKee is the best one available.

I should not like to think that any of us should be judged as quarreling with success when we support the Senator from Indiana.

I am not personally concerned with the problem of additional compensation; nor do I seek to suggest at this juncture that we compel him to surrender his retirement money.

I am concerned with the fundamental question of whether it is prudent to set aside one of the few explicit prohibitions against a military man taking control of an agency of Government.

In the report, Senators will find a listing of the few exceptions that have been made. They are in the Military Establishment, plus CIA. I believe the Senator cited the only case in which Congress has set this prohibition aside; and it was with respect to General Marshall.

All of us, if we were Governors or President, would feel that we had the right to obtain from our legislative body approval of the man whom we felt we needed to do a job effectively. No one is happy—at least, I am never happy—at the prospect of having to oppose a presidential nomination. In the time that I have been in the Senate, I have done so only once.

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] urges that the necessity of delivering an effective SST in prompt time is the really compelling reason which would require that we set aside the prohibition. Additionally, I believe he said that the relationship of the FAA with space argued for the setting aside of the prohibition.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; I said there are many reasons, among them the newer one of the SST possibility, and the relationship that we must have in our Federal air control, with 35 percent of our airspace being used by the military. Therefore it is not unusual for them to be interested in the control of that air space. We have not seen, through the years, any dominance or takeover of the FAA by the military.

Mr. HART. Thirty-five percent of the 100 percent would suggest that we ought to have some exceptionally persuasive reasons why the minority should be in the driver's seat.

However, quite aside from that, I have gained the strong impression that most of us feel that what bothers the President most is his sense of obligation that the Administrator "deliver" on the SST.

I wonder why this exceptional gentleman could not take the assignment of deputy administrator, to deliver on the SST, and avoid the problem which troubles all of us, namely, setting aside the prohibition. In that case we would not have to vote for a military man to head the FAA. Clearly, if the bill were referred back to committee, there would be an opportunity to develop this possibility.

Does anyone know whether the general would be offended by that suggestion? In the absence of that knowledge, perhaps it is prudent to permit us to have time to inquire.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield for the purpose of having the Senator ask a question of the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Would the Senator say about what the inquiry should be? Inquire about what?

Mr. HART. Whether General McKee would be willing to take assignment as the Deputy Administrator of FAA, the understanding being that he would have full authority to drive forward on the SST program which I understand is of the greatest interest in this situation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield further.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator believe that we should ask that of General McKee or that we should ask it of the President?

Mr. HART. Whichever is the appropriate point of inquiry, but I would hope that we would support the motion of the Senator from Indiana in order that we can do precisely that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Unless the Senate should pass the bill, is there any way in which we could have a hearing to discuss the qualifications of the proposed nominee for the position whose name the President would send to the Senate?

Mr. HART. It is my understanding that there has been an assumption here that we must lock the door before we find out, first, what his attitude on patent policy is, and, second, would he accommodate the general concern——

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are going to have hearings on the nomination. We can still confirm or refuse to confirm after we examine the nominee and his ability to run the Federal Aviation Agency. We shall talk to the private pilots again. They can come before the committee. Every one involved can come before the committee and we will have an opportunity to ask them anything that Senators desire to ask them. But the man cannot even be nominated unless the bill is passed.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That was my point. We cannot even conduct a hearing to find out his qualifications unless the bill is passed.

Mr. HART. Then, absent that knowledge and background, we have to resolve the question of whether we wish to surrender the prohibition that has been built in—and I think prudently——

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is all there is to it. I believe we explained that.

The distinguished assistant majority leader and whip, has said that if Senators had been on the floor and listened to certain speeches, they would know the answers to these questions. I wish to tell the Senator that I know about the subject from A to Z. I have listened to it for hours in the committee and out.

The original bill was passed some years ago. The author of the prohibition secured the passage of the bill because at the time we were having some problems between the military and private pilots.

The Senator from Oklahoma is the one who authored the prohibition. At the time we did not suggest that there would not be some cases in which we might have to make an exception.

Someone has said that the bill is a private bill. Of course it is a private bill. The calendar is full of private bills. We listen to hundreds and thousands of them. We make exceptions to legislation.

I suppose that it might happen again, and some of us will vote against it. I *voted against* a military proposal 2 or 3 times. Once in a while we have a problem.

We shall hold hearings and the Senator from Louisiana can have a whole morning to ask the nominee about patents, if he wishes to do so. The nominee has been down at NASA handling the problem there.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Giving it away.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If he was giving it away, *the Senator* from Louisiana could come in and show us where he has been giving it away, and we would listen attentively. I have listened to the Senator from Louisiana on this subject, and I have voted with him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have appreciated the Senator's votes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I voted with him on not only one occasion, but on scores of occasions. I know his attitude on the question. I agree with him. But we have a technical problem that we cannot solve unless we pass the bill. The President has seen fit to select the proposed nominee, and all the rest of those involved in the program for some reason—I suppose because of the man's ability—have also selected him. I do not know the man. I would not know him if he walked in the door.

Mr. HARTKE. That is a good reason to recommit the bill.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But I do not expect to know a man whose nomination is proposed by the President of the United States until he is nominated.

Mr. HARTKE. Is the Senator from Washington——

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator wish me to call the proposed nominee before he is nominated and ask him his views?

Mr. HARTKE. Is the Senator from Washington——

Mr. MAGNUSON. He has never even been in my office.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, have I the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I will let the Senator finish, then I shall finish my statement.

Mr. HARTKE. Does the Senator from Washington have any question whatsoever that the nominee in the present case is a man by the name of McKee?

Mr. MAGNUSON. No; I have no question about that. I wish to wait until he is nominated before I ask him to come before the committee.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I had yielded to the Senator from Michigan. I should like to inquire whether he has completed his statement.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I am not going to direct questions to the preacher until he is ordained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana has yielded to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I would not wish to go home tonight without making a brief comment about the suggestion of the Senator from Washington that private aviation and private fliers had trouble with the military years ago, but that it is not true now. I think there is a very great concern on the part of civilian aviation in this country that they will be in trouble. We shall buy difficulties if we set aside that prohibition. I shall therefore support the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe I correctly understood the Senator from Michigan to say that one of the principal reasons for the measure was the SST. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is the whole reason.

Mr. HART. My impression is that the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is the authority.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is the principal concern.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If that is the principal reason, I find myself less than enthusiastic for the measure. Why should I vote for the proposed legislation for that reason? I believe the SST is quite premature. We have a crash program to go to the moon. We can take the SST a little more slowly. I was wondering why that was such a persuasive reason to vote to set the present law aside.

Mr. HART. As one who, with some concern, supports the SST program, I shall not argue against the Senator from Arkansas supporting the Senator from Indiana. I do know that if we could fly 3½ hours to London, if that is what the SST will do, I would hope that the Congress would appropriate the funds necessary to get metropolitan America downtown a little faster, too.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. For the benefit of the Senator from Arkansas, I should like to say that what has upset the Senator from Louisiana is this: The Federal Aviation Agency has the best patent policy of any agency in Government. They do research, and then they take the patent rights for that research for the Government. They then license someone to use those patents on the condition that the user will pay a royalty.

The plan of the Agency, as it stands now, will be that if we develop the supersonic transport with Government funds, we want the big airplane companies that get the R. & D. contracts to pay us a $2 million royalty on every supersonic transport that they build. Thus, we will get our $26 million back on the first 13 planes.

The aircraft tycoons do not want that. They want the NASA and the Department of Defense kind of patent policy so that they would get the $26 million, develop the airplanes, and then they would have private patents instead of the Government having them and the taxpayers getting their money back.

From the point of view of the Senator from Louisiana, here comes a man from NASA where private patents are given away. He is a man from the Department of Defense, where patents are given away. He would occupy the office of Administrator of the FAA, the office now held by Najeeb Halaby, who does not wish to give patents away.

I do not want the man to get the job until I know that he is not going to give them all away. It is not proposed that we would save a few hundred dollars. We would give away $26 million that would be spent on research and development by the Federal Aviation Agency.

I thought so well of the patent policy of the Federal Aviation Agency that at one time I talked to the President about it. I said, "Mr. President, please read this. This is the finest statement I have ever come across. It is a wonderful idea."

The British Government developed the Vickers Viscount, as the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee so well knows. The Government would then charge a royalty. The Government did not get it all. They got only about one-third of the royalty for building that kind of airplane and using those patents. They got all their money back.

Would it not be sweet if we could get our money back on $15 billion of Government research?

The proposed nominee might be going to the FAA to reverse that policy. So far as I know, every little clerk and secretary up to the Administrator, Najeeb Halaby, is now against doing something like that. I would like to know the answer to the question of whether that patent policy would be changed under the proposed nominee.

I do not want to see the Senate pass a special bill so that the man whose name has been mentioned can have a job without my knowing the answer to those questions.

Senators have said, "Wait until the nomination comes to the Senate for confirmation."

It would make Senators look foolish. We would have legislated and proved by an act of Congress that we were a bunch of jackasses to pass a bill so that the proposed nominee could have the job and

then turn around and refuse to confirm him.

So the time to find the answer to the question is before we pass the bill. That is why I shall vote for the Senator's motion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Louisiana has spoken about $26 million. I understand that the SST would entail a subsidy of about $1 billion on the part of the Government. Is that correct?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not know about the whole cost.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Have they now raised the percentage to the point at which the Government is going to pay it all—60 percent, 80 percent, 90 percent—now it is 100 percent?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am informed that it is close to $1 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is what the newspapers stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is what the newspapers say.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Hearings will be held on that question, and it will be explained. The trouble is that we sometimes talk about things we do not know about.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am perfectly willing to admit that. That is often the case. In this case, I do not know about a great many things that have happened. Until I know more about the SST, I do not see why I should be for the bill or why I should vote for an exemption from the general law. It seems to me that this is an unpersuasive reason to exempt anybody.

I have nothing against General McKee; but on principle, if the reason given is to get on with the SST before somebody else does, it is a poor reason. We are always running a race with somebody else. I do not see how I can vote for the bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. From all I know about it—and I think I know more about it from speeches I have heard on the Senate floor—the best I can make of it is that this man must have the job because he is the man who can develop the SST. That is why the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. HARTKE. In the hearings, as appears on page 12, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK] asked Mr. Macy:

> How does it happen that you picked a military man or recommended a military man for this position? Were you unable to get anybody from the civilian field to take the job?

The only testimony in favor of General McKee was given by Mr. Macy. He answered:

> No. General McKee was selected as an individual rather than as a military man, as one who possessed this combination of experience, background, and skill that was directly relevant to the mission of the FAA, particularly the added mission of work on the supersonic transport.

Does that answer the question of the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the Senator from Arkansas for raising the question.

In my remarks today, and previously at greater length, I have cited fears and warnings of great leaders—military and civilian—concerning the danger to civilian government by military domination. These are not, I assure my colleagues, theoretical fears either for the safety of our Nation or the FAA. The actual present danger is pointed up not only by such people as the one who wrote the letter to the junior Senator from Ohio.

I had, just this week, a call from a physician who is highly qualified in aviation medicine. He held a top medical position in the old CAA and in the FAA from its inception. He is currently employed by private business in the same general field. He is closely familiar with the operations of the FAA in the medical field, which today is under the direction of Maj. Gen. M. S. White, on active duty in the Air Force.

My informant is no disgruntled employee, unable to substantiate his claims. He has come forth voluntarily with a statement, which I shall read verbatim in a moment.

The substance of the statement is that, under the administration of an active duty major general, the medical branch of the FAA has developed what the doctor describes as "a dedicated program of harassment of civilian doctors and administrative civilian employees." These doctors and administrative civilians have not been fired outright, but working conditions have been made so uncomfortable as to force the employees to throw in the towel and resign.

The doctor has told me that two of his friends recently found themselves in this position. These men, he told me, have left the FAA to continue their specialty of aviation medicine in private employment. In all, the doctor said, "a total of about 30 highly-trained professionals have left this agency in disgust." Their places have been taken by active and retired military officers.

The doctor believes that there is strong support for placement of retired military medical officers coming from the Aero-Space Medical Association, which is headed by a retired brigadier general by the name of William Kinnard. I do not know him; I have never met him.

The situation at NASA also has been called to my attention by this doctor. This is not directly concerned with S. 1900 and the FAA, but it is enlightening, as the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, since General McKee currently is employed at NASA.

The doctor said that he can furnish names and circumstances in detail to show that NASA is hiring retired military doctors by contract with a private organization. In this manner, a retired officer may be hired without restrictions of the Dual Compensation Act. Consequently, he may receive full retirement benefits and $25,000 in compensation from NASA paid through the private organization. Thus, total compensation runs around $35,000.

According to my informant, these doctors perform the same duties as civilian doctors working at Grade GS–14 for NASA. The duties performed by these retired military doctors are relatively light, I am told, consisting of six or eight physical examinations a day. At least one such doctor has been told he might maintain a private practice while performing services for NASA.

While these NASA activities are not our direct concern at this time, they are further evidence of what the doctor-informant called the military "buddy-buddy system" within the civilian establishment. I now present the voluntary statement of the prominent doctor who is willing to testify with names and verifications before any Senate committee, if the bill shall be recommitted:

> The military problems of civilian agencies can be appropriately highlighted by the medical problems in the Federal Aviation Agency. In spite of highly competent and experienced doctors willing to serve the Federal Aviation Agency, a major general on active duty in the Air Force was appointed Federal Air Surgeon. This was at least partly brought about by the recommendation of a professional society, the Aerospace Medical Association, also headed by a retired general.
>
> There immediately started a dedicated program of harassment of civilian doctors and administrative civilian employees. Many of them, experienced and capable doctors, resigned and the chief administrative officer and his assistant left to be replaced by retired Air Force colonels. A total of about 30 trained professionals have left this Agency in disgust and gone with private industry or other Government agencies. Many of these people are widely recognized as experts in their field.
>
> Active duty medical officers have been assigned to the Federal Aviation Agency and several retired military officers are to be processed in the near future for these jobs.
>
> I must urge an immediate investigation of these problems to determine why so many capable civilians have resigned and why the Civil Service Commission has refused to look into these problems in spite of repeated complaints.
>
> The structure of many professional organizations should also be studied. Many of these are continually staffed by retired military people, who in turn make recommendations to the Government of names for key jobs. This is known in medical circles as the "buddy-buddy" system.

These are serious charges, charges affecting the operation of this vital civilian Agency. Their clear import is to bear out the warnings I have previously sounded before the Senate.

In view of these charges and the willingness of the doctor, at least, to testify, and in view of questions raised about General McKee himself, it is both wise and fair that we should postpone action on S. 1900 while the Committee on Commerce holds further hearings.

Therefore, at the appropriate time I shall move to recommit S. 1900 to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Had the Senator released a copy of his prepared text prior to making his speech?

Mr. HARTKE. I had released it, and a copy is on the desk of every Senator.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So the text of the speech was on the desk of every Senator before the Senator from Indiana delivered it in the Senate?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I noticed that when the Senator from Indiana

reached a certain point in his speech, a Senator challenged the statement and suggested that the Senator was not doing his duty as he should be doing it, and that his evidence, when he reached that point of his speech, was completely erroneous.

Subsequently, when the Senator reached a point a few lines further on, another Senator suggested that both the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Louisiana, who merely asked a few questions, were guilty of impugning the honor of General McKee. He had certain prepared material in his hand.

At the close of his speech, the Senator from Indiana reached a highly important point, the matter of the doctors. I assume that the Pentagon and those who have been associates of the fine doctor, to whom the Senator from Indiana referred, had carefully screened the speech and prepared a defense and an answer and had discussed these issues with the Senator. Has the Senator heard any rebuttal to the medical proposition which he just finished discussing?

Mr. HARTKE. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator's statement has not been challenged?

Mr. HARTKE. No; no one has challenged it. The man is waiting. I could state his name on the floor of the Senate. I have no restrictions. However, I feel it better not to mention it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If there is nothing to the charge, should not General McKee be offered the opportunity to confront the man who made the statement and to explain his side of the argument?

Mr. HARTKE. In fairness to the general and to all others concerned, the only way to clear this matter up is to recommit the measure and have a full hearing in the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am one of only a few persons who heard both the first speech and the second speech of the Senator from Indiana. In my judgment, the Senator has made as persuasive and convincing speech about an issue as the Senator from Louisiana has heard in the Senate in a long time. The Senator deserves a vote of the Senate. I shall vote with him. By voting with him, I do not imply that General McKee is not a fine man. I am prepared to concede that he is a great American and deserves every one of the four stars he wears.

The Senator has made a strong case here. We have before us a very small amount of evidence, 25 pages of hearings, without even the appearance of the man himself.

The Senator has made a strong case. Whether he wins or loses, my judgment is that the Senator has rendered a service. I fear that he may have reduced his influence around Washington to some degree by doing it, particularly in some departments and agencies. However, I know that the Senator from Indiana is never worried about that kind of thing. Sometimes I fear that he has had more courage than sense, but I admire him for making the fine speech that he has.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for those fine words.

Quite honestly, as I indicated before, the books and articles which are written on this fear of military dominance and the military juntas all over the world are very real to people. I could not begin to tell the Senator how many people have recounted this fear to me after this question was raised.

If my action lessens my influence in Washington, then it will have to do that. That is all I can say. I know that when I started out, I thought I might be alone, but the Senator from Kansas joined with me in the committee.

The majority members of the committee had to make their report with their tongues in cheek and their eyes closed. The majority opinion is the most convincing argument that I am able to find to support my view.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, any time that a Senator attacks the military industrial combine, if he escapes with his life, he is lucky.

I say to the Senator that whether he wins on the vote or not, the Senator can feel that he has been exceedingly fortunate if he survives the day.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, in my judgment the bill is a bad bill. It establishes a bad precedent.

It is my intention to support the motion to recommit which has been made by the senior Senator from Indiana. Surely the time to have a hearing on this matter is before the barn door is closed by the enactment of this kind of special legislation which proposes to give to this officer the authority to accept this appointment.

I am certain that Gen. William F. McKee is the finest kind of man and, without a doubt, is a great American.

I received letters, it is true, from Dayton, Ohio, from the Wright-Patterson Air Field, where the general had served some time back. The answers that I made to those letters were very brief and to the point. I was not impressed by the objections which came from that source.

I simply stated in my answer to those letters: "Thanks a lot for your letter. I shall continue to oppose the authorization for the appointment of Gen. William F. McKee."

Mr. President, I now have a letter in my hand which is addressed to the Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE and the Honorable STEPHEN M. YOUNG. This letter came from the D. L. Edwards, who signed the letter as director of public relations of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL–CIO.

In his letter, he states:

Many of our civilians have now been replaced by servicemen in uniform.

This letter did not impress me. I had made up my mind on the subject. I shall report to my colleagues on another letter which I did find to be very persuasive.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I should like to see the letter written by the AFL–CIO which claimed that General McKee, for the purpose of acquiring a 4-star generalship, reduced the number of civilian employees at the Wright-Patterson Field without justification.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I do not have that letter with me. However, I have a copy of the letter which came from a George H. Zellner, secretary-treasurer of a lodge of the American Federation of Government Employees. It is addressed to me. I shall be glad to hand this to my colleague, if he wishes. I had not intended to advert to this. However, if my colleague wishes me to do so, I shall be glad to read it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the only letter that I should like to put in the RECORD—a full reproduction thereof—is the letter that was quoted by the Senator from Indiana to the effect that General McKee in order to obtain a 4-star generalship deliberately caused a number of civilian employees belonging to labor unions to be dismissed in order to ingratiate himself with the Washington office.

That is the only letter that I am concerned with.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall comply with the request of my distinguished colleague. I preface this with the remark that I was not impressed with the statements in the letter. However, I read the letter into the RECORD. This letter is from Lodge 1138, American Federation of Government Employees, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. The letter came from Fairborn, Ohio, which is in the area of the Wright-Patterson Airbase.

The letter reads:

I heartily commend you for the position you have taken in regard to the appointment of Gen. "Bozo" McKee (retired, thank goodness).

I, along with hundreds—and I suspect thousands—of Air Force base employees have nothing but contempt for a man of his caliber who had nothing but contempt for civilian employees, and who on his own, instituted several RIF's (reductions in force) in order to show enormous savings to the Air Force and to further his promotion to the 4-star rank.

He now feels he should have a civilian position.

There are many of the same type of retired officers now employed at Wright-Patterson AFB who have been forced out of the Air Force (not qualified for retention) and who by hook or crook have been appointed to civilian positions. They now have military retired pay, the medical benefits (free), the commissary and PX privileges, and the civilian pay looks good to them and they still try to walk over their civilian counterparts. Lord help the civilians if this is allowed to continue. Don't back down on McKee.

The letter is signed by George H. Zellner, secretary-treasurer.

I have placed that letter in the RECORD in compliance with the request of the senior Senator from Ohio, my colleague and friend.

I shall now refer to a letter signed by De Forest L. Brown, owner and manager of Brown's Airport. The statements in

this letter impressed me. I shall read two paragraphs therefrom. They read:

I have been in aviation for over 20 years, am an aircraft and powerplant mechanic, with inspection authorization, a private pilot and owner and operator of Brown's Airport, and I will back you 100 percent, and I know many people in aviation that will do the same.

We have got to get the military out of civilian aviation. This very fact has kept aviation from developing as we had hoped it would. Many people feel that civilian aviation is 20 years behind; when the FAA itself says that aviation activity is getting back to 1947 levels, is about proof enough?

I received today a letter from a lady in Painesville, Ohio, that also impressed me. Her name is Miss Anna Kosslow. She writes:

The military mentality is simply not the type for general government and our history proves it. Ironically, a military mind (Eisenhower's) spoke out about the dangers of Presidential administrations becoming influenced by "the military-industrial complex," which, in my opinion, is exactly what is happening now.

Mr. President, the men termed our Founding Fathers, who framed the Constitution of our country, provided that in the United States civilian authority must always be supreme over military authority. They were mindful of the inevitable conflict between civilian and military leaders. Apparently, from what has been permitted to take place in the executive branch of our Government during recent years, they were justified in being fearful of military domination in our Republic. These 18th-century fears on the part of those patriots who won the Revolutionary War and later wrote the Constitution and Bill of Rights are equally valid in the 20th century. Top officials in the executive branch of our Government would do well to reread some of the debates in the Federal Convention and refresh their minds that James Madison and other architects of our Constitution were determined that "the military shall always be subordinate to civilian power."

I think to do so would be well for some individuals who are apparently urging our President to appoint military men to civilian positions. I concur in the statement made by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana that President Johnson will go down in history as one of the greatest Presidents the United States has ever had. However, it seems to me there are too many military individuals being urged for appointments such as the appointment now being sought.

I have no personal objection to the appointment of General McKee. My concern is with the principle involved. I was impressed when a dear friend of mine, the wife of a general, telephoned me and my wife to say what a fine general he is and what a great administrator he would make.

I have never heard anything against him, personally. I am certain he is an outstanding general, that he deserves every one of the four stars he has earned. However, I think we should stop, look, and listen before we void a law that is a good law, and make it possible for a general to be appointed to this high position and have the tremendous authority that goes with the post.

It is estimated that 30,000 former officers in our Armed Forces are now enjoying positions in various Government departments and agencies at excellent salaries and, in addition, receiving retirement payments. This is a bad situation. Former President Eisenhower spoke out on this just before he left the White House following 8 years as Chief Executive. He said:

In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or the democratic process.

Let us keep the generals and former generals where they belong. The time is here for us in the Senate to demonstrate by our votes that we regard it as a potential danger to our American way of life and to the maintenance of honorable peace that we have these continual appointments of retired officers of our Armed Forces to important civilian positions in our Government.

The Federal Aviation Act of 1958 required and demanded civilian control of this Agency. There is no need to revoke or set aside an important section of this act so that an Air Force general may become Administrator. No Senator, I am certain, will take the position that our President is unable to find and nominate as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency a civilian of unquestioned ability, fine experience and achievements in civil life, and as loyal and as equally able, or more so, to serve as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency other than this general or any other retired Army officer. What is there about Gen. William F. McKee that causes him to be so exceptional and so outstanding that the law passed by Congress should be ignored or revoked and that he should be given this administrative position?

Mr. President, I am greatly impressed by the minority views expressed by our colleagues, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] who, following full consideration and study in committee, reported:

Mindful of the need for a strong Agency in charge of a single Administrator to oversee the complex problems of air safety, airport location and layout and a myriad of other problems, the Congress took exceptional pains in the exact wording of the act and the statement of intent vis-a-vis continuous civilian control of this vital function of Government.

The conference report on the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, states as part of the statement of the managers on the part of the House:

Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided with respect to the Administrator (as does the bill agreed to in conference, in sec. 301(b)) that at the time of his nomination he shall be a civilian * * *.

The report goes on to state:

The requirement in section 301(b) that the Administrator be a civilian at the time of his nomination means that he shall be a civilian in the strictest sense of the word. Thus, at the time he is nominated he may not be on the active or retired list of any regular component of the armed services or be on extended active duty in or with the armed services.

We would be making a big mistake today were we to deviate from that policy. Let us adopt the motion to recommit. The door will not then be closed on this matter. General McKee may then come before the appropriate committee, where the members of that committee will have an opportunity to see him and be impressed by his appearance and by the testimony that he gives in that hearing, and the other testimony that is given in that hearing. Then that committee can decide intelligently whether or not we should rescind the law that has been on our statute books.

We can see then whether we should do away with that provision of the law in order to give this very fine man a position which would make him the highest salaried man in the executive branch of the Government next to the President of the United States and the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes. I will take only 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 3 minutes from now——

Mr. LAUSCHE. Make it 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is not unreasonable.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that at 5:45 the vote be had on the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request that the Senate vote at 5:45? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With 1 minute to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, to show the baseless foundation of the attack on General McKee, I want to read to my colleagues from the papers submitted to the Senate by the Senator from Indiana, supported by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. On page 9 of these papers it is stated:

I have a copy of a letter written to the junior Senator from Ohio, who has joined me in this fight for civilian control. It comes from a leader of civilian employees at the Air Force installation.

It is now made clear that it comes from a sincere person who wants to protect the members of the union, the American Federation of Government Employees—AFL–CIO.

There is nothing wrong with that. It is perfectly sound. But what is wrong are the charges made by the man who wrote the letter. I will read the charges:

I, along with hundreds—and I suspect thousands—of Air Force Base employees have

nothing but contempt for a man of his caliber—

General McKee, that is—

who had nothing but contempt for civilian employees, and who on his own, instituted several RIF's (reductions in force).

This is the significant aspect of the malice, the injustice, and the wrong.

in order to show enormous savings to the Air Force and to further his promotion to the four-star rank.

Mr. President, is there something wrong with that? Does anyone believe that the President or the appointive power made General McKee a four-star general because he reduced the number of employees without justification?

If he reduced them because there were too many, and if he had the courage to tell the AFL and the CIO, "I will not listen to you," God bless him. He has my complete support.

That is what is wrong. That is all I wish to say to Senators now in the Chamber.

I do not wish the Army to run the Government. I do not wish the AFL or the CIO to run the Government. It seems from this letter that because General McKee had the courage to say no, they now not only charge General McKee, but also the President of the United States for having appointed General McKee to be a four-star general because he unjustly and maliciously reduced the number of employees actually needed at Wright-Patterson Air Field.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Senator from Oklahoma is recognized for the remainder of the allotted time.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in a moment or two we shall vote on a measure which can deny to the President the opportunity to bring before the Committee on Commerce for a study of confirmation of the nomination of a man who, after weeks of selection, was determined to be needed for this very difficult and technical position which must be filled as Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

We can deny to the President of the United States this right by a vote to recommit to have a careful, studied hearing, with General McKee before the committee, subject to answering any questions, whether it be on patent rights, or unfair and unverified letters from doctors who claim that something is wrong in the Space Agency Medical Department, or on all the other charges which have been thrown around the Chamber this afternoon.

Mr. President, I feel that the President of the United States has a responsibility, and that I also have a deep responsibility for the safe and effective operation of the Federal Aviation Agency, because the air commerce of this country is vital to its progress and vital to the safety of all transportation.

I believe that the Senate would be making a great mistake not to give the matter a hearing, not to bring this confirmation to a hearing, not to give the President the right to name the man of his choice, chosen after many weeks of deliberation.

I urge the Senate to vote down the motion to recommit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, fundamentally, I am opposed to the principle of military men taking positions of this kind, but I am forced to agree with the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that this man is the President's choice and I believe that the President is——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has now expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe that the President is right and that General McKee is the best qualified man——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to recommit H.R. 7777——

Mr. MANSFIELD. The job of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency is a very delicate one. I join the Senator from Oklahoma in urging that the motion to recommit be defeated.

Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] desired to participate in the debate on General McKee's appointment; but it was necessary for him to leave a few hours ago, in order to attend a hearing on the Senate Interior Committee, in Butte, Mont., tomorrow morning. I ask unanimous consent that Senator METCALF's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR METCALF

I do not know Gen. William F. McKee, who has been nominated for the position of Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency. I am certain he is an able, dedicated man. My consistent objection to having retired military personnel in civilian Government positions stems, not from reservations about the individuals, but from a deep conviction that retired career military men should not be placed in positions of responsibility in a civilian government. This is an open invitation to militarism in the civilian branch.

The situation we are discussing today is exactly what many of us predicted would happen last year, at the time of consideration of the Dual Compensation Act. We predicted that some retired career military individuals would take important civilian jobs, and would be paid more than the members of the Cabinet.

We are being asked to permit those who are retired from the military to take important and significant positions in the civilian government, and to draw dual compensation. This two-for-the-price-of-one situation is not open to anyone who retires from the civilian branch of the Government. It is not open to Members of Congress. In fact, it is not open to most individuals involved in early retirement programs, such as our policemen and our firemen. The only special exception has been retired members of the military, whose pension benefits are substantial.

Furthermore, we are being asked to open the door to a dangerous precedent.

The founders of this Nation made it clear that this Government must be under civilian control.

This principle was reiterated by one of our former Presidents—and the only man in recent times to be elected to that high office from a distinguished background as a professional military man. I quote from the farewell address of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, on January 17, 1961, when he warned:

"In the councils of Government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur also sounded the warning, in a speech at West Point, on May 12, 1962:

"Let civilian voices argue the merits or demerits of our processes of Government. These great national problems are not for your participation or military solution."

For the benefit of Senators, I attach to this statement my remarks on this subject of dual compensation, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110, part 12, page 16316.

STATEMENT OF JULY 20, 1964

"As I indicated in our debate on this bill recently, I am disturbed by some of its provisions and omissions. I am prepared to suggest that it be sent back to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with instructions that it be restricted to two points. The balance of the proposals should be resubmitted next year after appropriate, and I would hope, more detailed, and critical study. The committee should report back a bill which would cancel all obligations of officers found to have been illegally overpaid down to the date of the Comptroller General's ruling of July 9, 1962, and permit the employment of Federal civilian personnel in more than one position up to the length of the Federal workweek, plus a ceiling on total pay.

"I assume that these provisions of the bill are relatively noncontroversial. Certainly the ban on two civilian positions hampers several agencies and if guarded by an hours-per-week limit, as in this bill, plus a ceiling on compensation, which is not in this bill, it should be acceptable. As regards the former officers who have illegally received dual compensation, we should avoid working a hardship on innocent citizens even though the total involved is estimated to be $16 million, most of that sum having been paid out by the Defense Department. In reporting this bill back, I would hope that the committee would include in its report a statement of the total amount involved, the Federal agency, and include the name, military rank, and civilian position of every individual involved who has been illegally paid more than $500. I think the Congress has a right to know which agencies were delinquent in enforcing the law and the extent of their delinquency. I do not think that innocent persons should be penalized for agency delinquency, but since the agency which is apparently the chief offender is the one department which should be best informed on laws affecting military personnel I see no reason why all the facts should not be made available.

"In reporting this bill the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service asserted that it had four basic goals in mind.

"First, it intended to codify and simplify Federal law on dual compensation, a commendable aim, a job long overdue, but not one to be achieved at the expense of more important principles. A part of this first purpose, actually a second purpose was to afford what it terms 'relief' for the two groups of officers found to be overpaid by some $16 million. I am agreeable specifically to the second part of this first aim, and generally to the first part.

"The second purpose as stated in the committee's report was to remove the present ban on dual compensation for retired regular officers of the U.S. Armed Forces. The committee reports that under present law such an officer is prohibited from accepting Federal employment because of the maximum salary limitation established under the

Dual Office Act of 1894. Perhaps I do not grasp the complexities of these matters as quickly as I should, but are we being advised that the Dual Office Act of 1894 absolutely prohibits civilian employment of a retired Regular officer? That such an officer cannot give up his military pension, temporarily or permanently, and qualify for any job he wants and can get? If the ban is absolute, then I do not believe this to be just or right.

"The third purpose stated by the committee report is to modernize dual compensation to remove the $2,000 per annum ceiling on the amount of compensation any person may receive from the Federal Government for more than one civilian job. I do not think this is a controversial purpose or provision, except, as I have indicated—I think there should be a ceiling on the amount of compensation any individual holding more than one position can receive as long as we have millions of unemployed. This bill provides for no ceiling in salary—only in hours. This is unjust and unfair.

"To modernize a law we do not need virtually to erase it from the books, and I urge that this section be modified to place a ceiling on such dual compensation. The ceiling should not be higher than 1½ times the Federal minimum wage. Indeed the provision could be so written as to make it self-adjusting over the years, automatic modernization.

"The fourth stated purpose of this bill is to 'establish * * * a more equitable employment system' by allowing Regular officers, retired for length of service, or voluntarily, I presume, to take full-time civilian jobs with the Federal Government and still draw part of their military retirement pay. The parts of the bill pertaining to the achievement of this purpose are those which have excited the most firm and articulate opposition.

"The urgency of this bill, as I understand the matter, is primarily that of giving relief to the officers who were overpaid some $16 million. I understand this urgency and am sympathetic to giving them relief. Frankly, I do not consider the other sections as being urgent at all, but since the one modernizing restrictions on dual compensation for civilian jobs is apparently not highly controversial I see no reason why we should not deal with it this session.

"I am firmly opposed, however, to the other revisions proposed in this bill until there has been a great deal more fact gathering and an adequate set of hearings and a more comprehensive report is available for study.

"My first interest in this bill as it came from the committee was aroused by the alleged urgency of the measure, because of the pending necessity for securing reimbursement of the overpayments—but no figures were forthcoming on the amount of overpayments. The committee report on page 10 flatly stated that the committee was unable to obtain any specific cost information on the amount of the overpayments. Subsequently, in the recent debate, the figure of slightly less than $16 million was offered by the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. YARBOROUGH.

"This is certainly a bare-bones figure. We are offered no explanation as to what departments made such overpayments and to whom, nor are we even offered an explanation as to why the Comptroller should order repayment and so advise the agencies and 2 years later the committee is compelled to advise this body that the cost figure was not available. This reticence is peculiar, at least, and I would like the committee in its reconsideration of this bill not only to elicit additional information but also to indicate to the Senate why this information was so difficult to come by.

"Before we make any changes in the law on dual compensation, beyond that minor change referred to earlier, I think the appropriate committees should conduct hearings on the whole Federal retirement system. I see no more reason for being concerned about dual compensation and the alleged discrimination against regular military officers than I do about the glaring differences in the various Federal retirement and social security programs.

"On a simple bookkeeping basis, what justification is there for requiring a citizen to pay social security taxes; requiring a Federal civilian employee to pay 6.5 percent of his salary into a retirement fund; and levying no tax on the military? I think this is obvious and unjustifiable discrimination and should be brought to an end. It is my understanding that the civil service retirement fund is inadequate for the requirements which will be made on it in future years. Why? How inadequate? To what extent do the claims of retired military people on the civil service funds, deriving from their special privileges in counting military time toward retirement, constitute a drain on the civil service fund? How big is this drain?

"What valid arguments are there against establishment of a military retirement fund equivalent to the civil service retirement fund so that retired military men shifting to the civilian payroll can get credit for their military service—but so that the retirement fund can be the beneficiary of the sums accumulated in the military fund for the individual involved?

"It has been alleged that the military retirement obligations will mount rapidly in the years ahead and will soon reach $1 billion a year. To what extent could this rise be offset by adjusting the relationships between a military pension fund and a civilian pension fund? Will the provisions in this bill, pending here today, allowing $2,000 plus half of the remaining pension benefit for Regular military officers, encourage early retirement and step up the cost of military retirement?

"It seems to be that we cannot separate the laws on dual compensation and retirement, despite the honest effort made to do so here in our recent discussion of this measure. If pensioned retirement poses questions for civilian civil service employees, then it is quite unrealistic to say that this bill does not affect the retirement laws. There is no doubt that this bill does affect civil service employees; it does affect their retirement fund; it affects the total cost of Federal retirement programs—and it should be restudied with this in mind.

"I firmly believe that some of the inconsistencies in Federal law as regards the right to retire with compensation can be eliminated or reduced. What set of circumstances in real life calls for a cut in the social security payments when wage income rises above $1,200, and knocks out social security payments entirely at about $1,700? Yet a retired enlisted man or Reserve officer can draw his retirement benefits regardless of his wage earnings.

"I am not prepared to say at the moment in which direction the change should be made. But I do not believe there is any justice in telling a hardrock miner in Montana that if he earns a few dollars in his old age his social security will be reduced or eliminated entirely, while his son, retired from the military, can draw his full retirement benefits regardless of his other earnings. Surely we can achieve more equity in the law than this.

"The original justification for imposing a penalty on social security recipients was a make-work concept. We were going to provide some old-age aid, but require that the aged yield jobs to young people.

"As nearly as I can gather, the original justification for an inflexible and very generous retirement policy for the military was to offset low wages and facilitate maintaining a youthful military force. Possibly these are also the justification for not withholding retirement taxes from military salaries. I submit that this is poor logic and poor administration on withholding taxes—and places a burden on the civil service retirement fund. I submit that a generous retirement program is a poor substitute for adequate military pay. And I would like to see a study made of the connection between a generous retirement program and recruitment of military personnel. It is facts I would like to hear, not rationalizations.

"I doubt very much that the marked differences between military and civilian retirement rights can be justified in the clear light of a committee hearing. Some differences, very well, but not the present sharp contrast. One requires contributory payments; the other does not. One is very generous in terms of the length of service required, the other is not. One is, with minor exceptions, irrevocable; the other is a fragile thing—the civilian retirement—a fragile thing which can be reduced or eliminated on small provocation.

"I submit we need a study of all of these things before we undertake to enact legislation this comprehensive.

"I think the dual compensation laws should be modernized. I think they should be equitable. I think they should cover the waterfront. In general, I think dual compensation should be eliminated—that this should be the guiding principle of those drafting the new legislation. If we cannot make the dual compensation laws, as revised, yield immediate equity because of standing commitments to classes of the military already in retirement, then I submit that the laws should be so written as to achieve equity among all military retirees after the date of enactment.

"I do not believe that the present bill achieves equity. I do not believe that its accomplishments outweigh its shortcomings. I don't think it is the best bill by any means that can be drawn on this subject, and I urge that another attempt be made.

"I have studied many hearings on many bills, and I submit to you in all charity that these hearings leave more questions unasked and unanswered than any other set of hearings I can recall.

"I trust no member will take these remarks personally. They are not intended as criticism of any person or committee. The burden of our work is heavy. Time is always at a premium—but I must insist that I do not believe that this measure should pass this year. I believe that it should be recommitted with instructions.

"Special privilege if we must have it must serve a vital public function. It should not be suffered as a result of hurried compromise.

"Our responsibilities are broad—we have time and the will to write better law—it is our responsibility to do so and to remember that special privilege and discrimination breed riots in hell."

THE DUAL COMPENSATION ACT OF 1964 NOT THE REAL ISSUE IN THE M'KEE CASE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the past few days there has been some discussion of the Dual Compensation Act of 1964 as it affects this bill, S. 1900, and the possible appointment of General McKee to be Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

Some of the remarks which have been made imply that Congress was not fully aware of what it was doing when the Dual Compensation Act was passed. I had the pleasure and the responsibility of serving as chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee which considered the Dual Compensation Act, and I was the

floor leader in the debate which resulted in the passage of that act.

Contrary to the impression which may have been made, the Dual Compensation Act was the product of 9 years' study of the problem of employing retired military personnel. Extensive hearings on that bill were held in both the House and the Senate committees. The staffs of both committees worked for many months, with representatives of the administration and other interested parties, to produce the bill which Congress passed.

Considerable debate was held on the floor of both the Senate and the House before the bill was passed. No aspect of that legislation was not given very careful consideration.

Contrary to a remark made by one Senator yesterday, the Dual Compensation Act did not "punch a hole in the dike," to allow retired officers to be employed in civilian positions. The history of dual-compensation legislation is long and involved. The 1964 act modernized and simplified some 70 years of piecemeal legislation. Prior to the 1964 act, more than 50 statutes regarding dual employment and dual compensation had been passed. Some 200 decisions of the Comptroller General had interpreted those laws. It was truly an administrative monstrosity to understand and apply those statutes. Mistakes were frequently made, much to the disadvantage of innocent employees who accepted positions in the civilian service, and later were told they had been employed in violation of the law, and owed the Government the entire salary they had earned as civilian employees. In some instances, employees owed as much as $50,000, each, for illegal salary payment. To correct this and other inequities and to allow the Government to offer employment opportunities to some highly skilled retired military persons, the Dual Compensation Act of 1964 was passed. It opened no floodgates.

On the contrary, under the old statutes and interpretations, the only group of retired military personnel who were excluded from Federal employment in civilian positions were regular commissioned officers who retired for length of service. The fiscal limitations on combined income prohibited their employment, because of the language of the Dual Offices Act of 1894. All enlisted men, all Reserve officers, and any Regular officers retired for disability were eligible for any civilian position with full retirement pay. The only ones not admitted to Federal employment before 1964 were the Regular officers retired for length of service. They amount to less than 10 percent of the military personnel who retire each year. What Congress did in 1964 was to extend to these officers the same privileges of law that were enjoyed by all others. As a suitable compromise, Congress decided to reduce their yearly retired pay to an amount equal to $2,000, plus half of the remainder. That reduction in pay applies to Regular commissioned officers and to warrant officers. It does not apply to Reserve officers, because, under the old law, Reserve officers were not affected. Congress did not deem it necessary to take away from Reserve officers a privilege which they had enjoyed for 70 years.

My remarks today are not aimed at the wisdom of appointing retired officers to civilian positions. No Member of the Senate is any more interested in the supremacy of civilian control than I am. My remarks are not aimed at the change to be made in the Federal Aviation Act by the bill under discussion today. I speak only on the subject of the meaning of the Dual Compensation Act. I believe its purpose has been misunderstood in the past few weeks. If Congress wishes to make changes in that law, I am confident that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will entertain any amendments any Senator wishes to propose. As a member of that committee, I will certainly share in that responsibility.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The question is on the motion to recommit H.R. 7777?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair stated that to the Senate while the Senator from Montana was making his final argument.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] is paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 143 Leg.]

YEAS—33

Aiken	Fannin	Moss
Allott	Fulbright	Murphy
Bennett	Hart	Nelson
Burdick	Hartke	Pearson
Carlson	Hayden	Simpson
Case	Holland	Smith
Clark	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Cooper	Long, La.	Williams, Del.
Douglas	McGovern	Yarborough
Ellender	Morse	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—35

Anderson	Inouye	Proxmire
Bartlett	Jackson	Randolph
Bass	Kuchel	Ribicoff
Bayh	Lausche	Robertson
Bible	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Mansfield	Scott
Brewster	McCarthy	Stennis
Cannon	McClellan	Symington
Cotton	McGee	Thurmond
Curtis	Monroney	Tydings
Harris	Pastore	Williams, N.J.
Hruska	Pell	

NOT VOTING—32

Byrd, Va.	Hill	Montoya
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Mundt
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Muskie
Dirksen	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Dodd	Kennedy, N.Y.	Prouty
Dominick	Long, Mo.	Russell, Ga.
Eastland	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Fong	McNamara	Smathers
Gore	Metcalf	Sparkman
Gruening	Miller	Talmadge
Hickenlooper	Mondale	

So Mr. HARTKE's motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with my colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF]. If he were present and voting he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Minesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is paired with the Senator from Virigina [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE]. If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts would vote "yea," and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 20, as follows:

[No. 144 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Allott	Hruska	Pell
Anderson	Inouye	Proxmire
Bartlett	Jackson	Randolph
Bass	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Bible	Kuchel	Russell, S.C.
Boggs	Lausche	Scott
Brewster	Magnuson	Simpson
Byrd, W. Va.	McCarthy	Stennis
Cannon	McClellan	Symington
Carlson	McGee	Thurmond
Cotton	McGovern	Tower
Curtis	Monroney	Tydings
Fannin	Morton	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Moss	Young, N. Dak.
Hart	Murphy	
Hayden	Pastore	

NAYS—20

Aiken	Ellender	Nelson
Bennett	Ervin	Pearson
Burdick	Fulbright	Smith
Case	Hartke	Williams, Del.
Clark	Holland	Yarborough
Cooper	Long, La.	Young, Ohio
Douglas	Morse	

NOT VOTING—34

Bayh	Javits	Mundt
Byrd, Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Muskie
Church	Kennedy, Mass.	Neuberger
Dirksen	Kennedy, N.Y.	Prouty
Dodd	Long, Mo.	Robertson
Dominick	Mansfield	Russell, Ga.
Eastland	McIntyre	Saltonstall
Fong	McNamara	Smathers
Gore	Metcalf	Sparkman
Gruening	Miller	Talmadge
Hickenlooper	Mondale	
Hill	Montoya	

So the bill (H.R. 7777) was passed.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the motion by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 1900 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). Without objection, the bill is indefinitely postponed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisana. Mr. President, I have a privileged matter that I would ask to have called up.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I wonder if my able friend the Senator from Louisiana would yield so that I might query the majority leader, while Senators are in the Chamber, as to what is contemplated for tonight, tomorrow, and the remainder of next week.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Louisiana will yield, I shall be delighted to reply to the acting minority leader.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield for that purpose.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1966

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 321, H.R. 6453, making appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bills?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT LIMITING DEBATE ON DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe this request has been cleared with all interested parties.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate meets on Tuesday, June 22, 1965, there be a time limitation of 1 hour on the Ribicoff amendment to the District of Columbia appropriation bill, the time to be controlled by the mover of the amendment, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the chairman of the subcommittee the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]; that on other amendments the time be limited to 30 minutes, 15 minutes to a side, if there are other amendments to be offered, because I believe they can all be taken care of on Monday; and that the vote on the passage of the bill be had not later than 2:30 p.m. on Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator request that paragraph 3 of rule XII be suspended?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Tuesday, June 22, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6453) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, debate on any amendment (except one to be offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] which shall be limited to one hour), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to one-half hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

Ordered, further, That the Senate will proceed to vote on final passage of the bill not later than 2:30 o'clock postmeridian on Tuesday June 22, 1965.

THE LATE SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA—MEMORIAL ADDRESSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time set aside for the delivery of eulogies to our

late, departed, beloved colleague, the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Johnston, be moved from 2 p.m. to 3 p.m. on Tuesday June 22, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no debate on the District of Columbia appropriation bill tonight, unless some Senator wishes to speak on it. After conferring with the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], it is hoped that an agreement can be reached for a reasonable limitation on debate and a vote on the bill on Tuesday. That would not preclude the taking of votes on committee amendments or votes on other matters.

Following the disposition of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, it is the intention of the leadership to call up the silver coinage bill; but a little leeway may be needed in that respect. *Perhaps the military* procurement bill will be taken up between those two bills. But, in general, that is the program contemplated for next week.

Mr. KUCHEL. Does the distinguished majority leader contemplate a yea-and-nay vote on the conference report on the excise tax bill; and can he confirm the happy rumblings in the Chamber that the Senate will go over until Monday?

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As to the other question, I cannot answer the Senator from California.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. The excise tax bill passed the Senate with only four dissenting votes. The conference was most successful. However there may perhaps be debate on it.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the Senator from Louisiana plan to ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the excise tax conference report?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Not unless some Senator asks for one.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a question. Did I correctly understand him to say that the Senate would reconvene on Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. I did not understand him when he said what measures would be taken up.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The District of Columbia appropriation bill was laid before the Senate a few minutes ago. There will be no yea-and-nay votes on that bill this evening. There may be yea-and-nay votes beginning on Monday, although I anticipate none as of now. Other measures may be taken up on that day. The chances are about 90 to 10 against yea-and-nay votes.

ICELANDIC INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, today is the 21st anniversary of the independence of the independent Republic of Iceland. I wish to pay tribute to that country's contributions to our Nation.

We in North Dakota are fortunate to number among our citizens about 1,000 Icelandic-Americans, who have settled in the northeastern corner of our State. They are part of a small group of American citizens whose democratic heritage is paralleled by that of very few other national groups in our country.

Although Iceland has been independent only since 1944, hundreds of years earlier its citizens knew the characteristics of democracy. Indeed, Iceland has one of the oldest and most distinct democratic heritages of any country in the world today; it can be traced to the year A.D. 930, when the Vikings who settled on this island established the Icelandic Althing, or Parliament—the first democratic body of its kind north of the Alps. Its laws provided for the various hazards of life, including mutual protection from fire; and its original code initiated trial by jury 282 years before King John of England signed the Magna Carta.

The Icelandic people have contributed their energies and resources and, most important of all, their democratic and cultural heritage to the communities of America where they have settled. I am proud that the community of Mountain, N. Dak., is among the few distinctive Icelandic-American communities remaining in our country.

Mr. President, the story of the Icelandic immigration to America is truly a remarkable tale of adventure, struggle, and personal sacrifice. The Icelanders came from a land rural, wild, and lonely; a land of glaciers, lava, heather, and stormy seas; a country of silence—the silence of vast spaces impinging on the scattered settlements. To make their way in comparatively crowded and industrialized America, the immigrants had to summon all their resolution and initiative.

The first Icelanders to come to the New World arrived about 1870. They came both to Canada and to the United States, and worked their way along the Great Lakes and the central boundary of the two countries until they settled in North Dakota and Minnesota in about 1900.

One of the most lucid available accounts of this migration is contained in a book entitled "Modern Sagas," written by Thorstina Walters, herself an Icelander, reared near Mountain, N. Dak.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from her book, telling of the settlement of the Icelanders in North Dakota be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I commend it to all Senators as an excellent, if somewhat brief, account of a part of American history.

There being no objection, the excerpt was order to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER III. THE TRAILS CONVERGE—THE DAKOTA TERRITORY

It soon became evident to Páll Thorlaksson that the general well-being of the settlement had not progressed since his visit of the previous year. To be sure, more Icelandic immigrants had come during the summer of 1877. There was an increasing number of pioneer cabins and the clearings around the lowly homes had been enlarged. Many of these clearings had within them recent graves of those who had succumbed to the smallpox plague of the preceding winter. No dreamer of the future pictured Lake Winnipeg as it now is, a great waterway with an inexhaustible supply of fish. What Thorlaksson saw was a vast expanse of ice and marshy shores where his compatriots were waging a battle for survival, in many instances a losing struggle. In thinking through the problems that confronted the Icelandic settlers, the young minister was strengthened in his belief that the United States had more to offer to his countrymen.

Early in the year of 1878, a number of discontented settlers met in Thorlaksson's home with the objective of laying the initial plans for finding a suitable area for an Icelandic settlement on the American side of the boundary line. A committee of three, the Reverend Páll Thorlaksson, Sigurdur Josua Björnsson, and Magnus Stefansson, was chosen to make a tour of exploration. At first, it was felt that Minnesota would offer the best opportunities, but that plan was changed when one of the committee men, Magnus Stefansson, met a newspaper editor in Winnipeg, Mr. Hunter, who unreservedly advised them to seek land in the Dakota Territory. He explained that all suitable land had been taken up in Minnesota. The only land available was in the northwestern part of the State, near the Red River and was not, in his opinion, any better than that which they already had in "New Iceland." He suggested to Stefansson to go to the border town of Pembina, Dakota Territory, saying that he felt certain that within a radius of some 30 miles of the town there would be land that would meet the requirements of the group. Hunter then gave Stefansson two letters of introduction to two friends of his in Pembina. The other two members of the committee, Thorlaksson and Björnsson, were not enthusiastic at first, but finally Björnsson agreed to accompany Stefansson to Pembina while Thorlaksson remained temporarily behind in Winnipeg.

The town of Pembina was at that time quite an important gateway to the United States, situated as it was on the Red River and receiving traffic from both the North and the South. The two Icelanders were advised to seek land southwest of the little town of Cavalier, some 30 miles from Pembina. It was explained to them that while the soil of the prairie was considered superior, there was a disadvantage for poverty-stricken people in settling on a treeless prairie.

After conferring for 2 days in Pembina, the Icelandic prospectors set out on foot for the town of Cavalier and then and there received their first introduction to the mud of the Dakota prairie. But a little inconvenience of that nature did not discourage them, for the information they had gained kindled hope in their hearts. They had along with them a letter of introduction to John Bechtel, a progressive farmer in Cavalier. Mr. Bechtel was of German ancestry, having come to the Dakota Territory from Pennsylvania in 1875. He became a much valued friend to the Icelandic pioneers during their first years of settlement. Stefansson and Björnsson spent the first night in Cavalier at Mr. Bechtel's home and the next day he drove them to the home of a Norwegian-American Civil War veteran, Butler Olson, who had homesteaded 6 miles west of Cavalier. There the two Icelanders stayed for a week enjoying the hospitality of Mr. and Mrs. Olson. Mr. Olson drove them south and west around the neighborhood and then finally down to Pembina where they rejoined Thorlaksson. Three others were added to the group, settlers from

"New Iceland," Jóhann Hallsson; his son, Gunner, and Arni Thorlaksson.

After Björnsson and Stefansson had reported on their findings, the five Icelanders decided to return again with Olson. He arranged to have them driven around by a halfbreed who knew the country intimately. They had five horses and two Red River carts, and took turns riding and driving. Mr. and Mrs. Olson had furnished them with bread and butter, while the halfbreed shot wild ducks that they roasted by an open fire. They examined the country for 4 days around the territory where the Pembina County towns of Hallson, Gardar and Mountain are now situated. Subsequent to this cursory examination of the area, they returned to the Lake Winnipeg settlement to report to their countrymen.

It was only a matter of a few days until a large number of the settlers of New Iceland had determined to try their fortune in the Dakota Territory. The first to make the difficult trek by land and water were the members of the exploration committee and their families. They traveled to Winnipeg by a small boat belonging to one of the settlers and then by a Red River steamer to Pembina. On June 6, 1878, they set out over the trackless prairie with two yoke of oxen. They left Pembina at dawn, arriving at the home of Butler Olson that night at 10. By then, the faithful oxen had trudged 30 miles through mud and water.

The most pressing task of the newcomers was that of erecting a shelter and this first Icelandic home in the Dakota Territory was built where the town of Hallson now is. Fifteen miles distant to the west were the Pembina Mountains, only hills, to be sure, as compared with the mountains of Iceland, but, nevertheless, one of the reasons for the immigrants' choice of the locality. On the banks of the Tongue River, that drained the terrain, were majestic oaks, elms and other trees. The work was made easier through the unwavering hope that the settlers had of the future. Among these builders in the wilderness was a lad of 18, Jonas Jonsoon. In his memoirs recalling this pioneer work he wrote: "I was assigned as a cook for the group. Not that I had any special skills in that particular line, rather because the older men disliked such work, whereas I was a good-natured lad, ready to undertake anything. I developed a system of my own for making bread, which consisted of digging a hole in a large tree stump, then putting in flour, and water from the Tongue River. Presently I had kneaded a dough that I shaped into round cakes and baked over an open fire. I can assure you that I was kept busy making these cakes."

The cabin was completed June 23, 1878, and nine people moved into it. There, 2 weeks later, was borne the first child of Icelandic parentage in the settlement, Hallur Egilsson. There was no trained doctor or nurse to render mother and child the necessary assistance, but reports have it that all went well with both.

During the years 1878–81, a large number of settlers came from Lake Winnipeg (New Iceland) to the Dakota Territory. The Canadian authorities tried to stem the tide of emigration from the Lake Winnipeg settlement by demanding the return of the money that the Dominion Government had given to the pioneers. The authorities argued that the money had been donated with the understanding that the Icelanders were to remain permanently in Canada. When the departing Icelanders paid no attention to the governmental objections, they frequently found themselves in difficulties. The Icelandic pioneers also encountered at times some bitterness on the part of their countrymen who chose to remain behind. However, neither Government interference nor the coolness of friends could stop the determined men and women who saw a fairer day dawning in Dakota Territory. Some of the Icelanders, lacking means of transportation, covered the distance of 160 miles from the Lake Winnipeg settlement to the Dakota Territory on foot. Those who had children were very much handicapped. The story is told of one Icelander whose sole property was one cow. He managed to acquire a Red River Cart into which he placed his wife and children and then hitched the cow to it. He then started for the Dakota Territory. Unfortunately, the Canadians confiscated the cow at the boundary line. The ingenious settler was not at all discouraged. He and his family struggled on foot the rest of the way. Another couple dragged their child and baggage on a sleigh all the dreary miles from Lake Winnipeg to the Dakota Territory. Many of those who arrived destitute in the new locality had left Iceland with considerable means, lost one way or another during the confusion of the first few years. Among those following the Icelandic pioneer trail from New Iceland to what is now North Dakota were Jóhann and Ingebjörg Stefánsson with their three children, Jóhannes, Inga, and the youngest, Vilhjálmur, the future explorer, then aged 18 months.

Through the Reverend Páll Thorlaksson, the possibilities of the Dakota Territory were explained to the Icelanders in Shawano County, Wis., who by that time had learned many valuable lessons in American farming from their neighbors of greater experience. That small Icelandic group had been forced to recognize that cultivation of the soil where they were was beyond their capabilities due to the heavy timber all around. Shawano County required more initial power and capital than they had, therefore it seemed to them that the Dakota prairies offered more opportunity for those who had willing hands, but very little money. The first step towards evaluating the Dakota Territory was taken by six Icelanders from Shawano County who went there on an exploration tour the summer of 1878, driving five teams of horses. There they joined others of their compatriots who were also exploring the area under the able leadership of the Norwegian-American, Butler Olson.

The Dakota Territory of 1878 was just emerging from the terrors of the Custer massacre of 1876. Sitting Bull was still living, and to the Icelanders his name was synonymous with some mighty troll of their folklore. Olson's leadership was of the highest repute for not only did he know the country but he was a man of experience which included 3 years of service in the Civil War. The Icelanders had not proceeded far on their way on the virgin prairie when they noted a large band of Indians in what appeared to be a warlike mood. The little band of white men was at a great disadvantage in defense against an attack. Their weapons were limited to a rifle that Olson carried, a relic of Civil War days, a pistol and a pocket knife belonging to two of the Icelanders. They took counsel as to how to meet this emergency. Mr. Olson suggested that the best procedure would be to tie the horses together and then the men should crawl into the tall marshland grass and hide. They lay for several hours hidden by the damp grass. When they finally dared to raise their heads above it and survey the surroundings, there were no Indians to be seen. Olson was then of the opinion that the Indians had mistaken them for a part of the territorial militia from the border town of Pembina, much feared by the Indians for its members were reputed to be quick on the trigger. Orders had been given to the Indians not to gather in large bands on the prairie.

The Icelanders and their guide explored the country quite extensively around the present sites of the towns of Hallson, Mountain, and Gardar in Pembina County. They were pleased with what they saw and returned to Shawano County, Wis., to report favorably on their findings. The summer of 1879 marked the exodus of all the Icelanders from the community in Shawano County. Women and children traveled by rail while the men and boys walked and drove the cattle. An occasional family moved by a method they had learned from the American pioneers, by covered wagons. Those who walked averaged about 25 miles a day. It took them a month to walk from Shawano County, Wis., to the locality that they had chosen in the Dakota Territory. These Icelandic pioneers were joined by a number of their compatriots who for one reason or another were not satisfied with their homesteads in the Lincoln and Lyon Counties of Minnesota. Generally speaking, these Icelandic settlers were not as poverty stricken as the ones from the colony around Lake Winnipeg.

The hopes of a better and fuller life that centered in the Icelandic settlement in the Red River Valley of the Dakota Territory traveled across the Atlantic to Iceland where the movement to emigrate became nationwide. By 1880, a large number of settlers direct from Iceland arrived on the Dakota prairies.

The initial steps of the pioneers were very difficult. As long as the much publicized Red River Valley soil failed to produce, there was want everywhere. The years from 1878 to 1881 were the most trying ones. In spite of their failure to raise grain and vegetables in the immediate neighborhood, it was of paramount importance for the pioneers to live on the land they had settled in order to prepare the soil for production and to gather hay for their livestock.

The winter of 1879–80 was the most severe on record in that part of the country. Many Icelandic homes were without food. However, help always came before there were any serious consequences. In many instances, this help came through loans that Thorlaksson had solicited from well established Norwegian-American farmers. As a rule, he himself was responsible for repayment. It was to him that the settlers turned when all other roads seemed to be impassable. In addition to loans, there were also direct gifts from the Norwegian-Lutheran Synod, as well as from individuals. People tried to make a little go as far as possible and were thrifty in every way. By the spring of 1880, one of the most pressing problems was lack of seed. The Reverend Páll Thorlaksson was then in Minnesota under treatment for his health. He kept in continuous contact with the settlement. At his request, Haraldur Thorlaksson, his brother, one of the Icelanders who had come from Wisconsin the previous summer, mortgaged a small herd of cattle that he owned, in order to purchase seed for some of the settlers, as well as some very essential farm machinery.

It soon became evident to Thorlaksson that something more extensive in scope was required to help the settlers than the sacrifice made by a few individuals in their midst. Therefore, in spite of his poor health, he traveled through the Norwegian settlements in Minnesota and gathered together 40 head of cattle and 100 barrels of flour to be paid for in 2 years at 10 percent interest. Transportation amounting to $300 was saved through him. He wrote to the St. Paul, Minneapolis & Manitoba Railroad requesting it to give free transportation of the cattle and flour to the border town of Pembina. The railroad agreed, and as a result the flour and the cattle arrived almost immediately in Pembina. This good news traveled fast through the Icelandic settlement. Hope was rekindled, but, unfortunately, this help was still very inadequate, a mere drop in the bucket.

Realizing that further assistance was needed at once, Thorlaksson, although still ill, undertook a trip on horseback through the progressive Norwegian settlements in

Minnesota. He acquired 43 head of cattle on the same terms as the previous ones and the railroad transported this herd to Pembina free of charge, too. Yet even this additional help was not sufficient, since a number of needy families had just arrived in the settlement from the Lake Winnipeg communities. Presently, Thorlaksson called a meeting for the purpose of evaluating the overall situation in the settlement and through this meeting to determine what additional assistance was needed. Following this meeting, the tireless young minister set out once more in July of 1880 to the Norweigan communities in Minnesota in order to arrange for the essentials required to insure the livelihood of the Icelandic community in Pembina County, Dakota territory, until such time that the settlers could manage through their own resources.

Thorlaksson traveled extensively through the Norwegian communities in Minnesota and was well received everywhere, especially by the clergymen who supported him in every way possible, either taking him around themselves or lending him a horse. After 2 months of travel he had gathered a herd of 85 head of cattle, 65 sheep, as well as small sums of money, all for the benefit of the Icelandic communities in the Dakota territory. Most of the animals were sold on 3 years credit or were outright contributions. Two men and two boys came from the Dakota territory to drive the herd to the Icelandic settlements where it arrived October 2, 1880. This marked Thorlaksson's final effort to seek outside help to assist the poverty-stricken pioneers on the road to self-support.

There were, to be sure, many of the original Icelandic settlers in Dakota territory who managed without loans or other outside help solicited by Thorlaksson. But the considered opinion of many of the Icelandic founding fathers interviewed by this writer is overwhelmingly to the effect that the Reverend Páll Thorlaksson's work prevented dire suffering at a time when aid was urgent. Unquestionably, his work was a very important factor in establishing the settlement permanently and placing it on a producing basis. One fact not to be overlooked was that there was neither work nor credit to be had in the immediate area of the settlement. The locality where the Icelandic pioneers settled in the Dakota territory was in an extreme frontier state, therefore, contact with firmly established, progressive Norwegian settlements was invaluable. Not only did the pioneers receive material aid from them but they also learned many important lessons in adjustment to their environment.

The loans made by the Norwegian-Americans to the Icelanders were almost without exception paid back with interest within the prescribed time. It was not long before an Icelander's word was considered first-class security for credit in the Dakota territory. Unfortunately, there is one never to be forgotten blot on this Norwegian-Icelandic cooperation. A Norwegian-American businessman who dealt reputably with Thorlaksson in the beginning, changed his manner of doing business and became known through the Icelandic communities as a man of very unsavory reputation. It seemed that he preferred farms on which he held the mortgage to repayment of loans. These farms that he took as security for loans at exorbitant interest rates tempted him to ruthlessness in collecting his money. This man, however, was the exception, for the annals of Icelandic pioneering in North Dakota relate repeatedly the unselfish aid and cooperation of the Norwegian-Americans in Minnesota and the nearby States.

When the Icelanders first came to the Dakota territory, there were three laws for filing on land: Preemption, tree claim, and homestead. The first and third laws required that the one who filed should live 3 years on the 160 acres of land allotted to him before obtaining a deed for it. The tree claim made it obligatory to plant 6,000 trees, and if they were all living at the end of 3 years, the pioneer received a deed for the land. Most of the Icelandic immigrants availed themselves of the homestead laws.

Almost without exception, the Icelandic pioneers in Pembina County were destitute. Some had, however, more experience than others in meeting the problems of the new environment. The ones least equipped were those who came from the settlement around Lake Winnipeg or direct from Iceland. But in general most of the early settlers were young, energetic, and thrifty. They were anxious to learn from the experience of others who were better oriented in the new land than they were.

The home that the Icelanders chose lay in the northeastern corner of the immense Dakota territory, which stretched from the Red River on the east, to Montana on the west, and from the Canadian border south to Nebraska. The scattered settlers that the Icelanders found there had not had time to recover from the Custer massacre. And the restlessness of the Indians and halfbreeds on the Canadian side culminating in the Riel Rebellion of the middle eighties aroused general alarm among the newcomers. But in not too long a time the Icelanders in the Dakota territory began to take great pride in breaking the sod and to have a liking for the prairie. To them, the prairie became a symphony of sounds. There were times when the tall, swaying grass seemed to speak the language of the ocean waves that washed the shores of their oceanbound homeland. And often enough the faint stirring of the breeze whispered of hidden opportunities still lying buried under the soil of Dakota's vast prairie.

LIVESTOCK MARKETING

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, during the June 10 visit of 100 South Dakota farmers to the Capitol, in the interest of farm legislation, William J. Dougherty, president of the Sioux Falls, S. Dak., Livestock Exchange, presented to a group of Senators a statement on the situation of livestock markets and marketing, to be submitted to the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The suggestions Mr. Dougherty made for the protection of farmer interests are well worth our consideration. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that his statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is William J. Dougherty, president and cattle salesman of Adams-Dougherty Commission Co., and president of Sioux Falls Livestock Exchange, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Sioux Falls is a terminal market, ranking ninth in cattle, ninth in hogs, and third in sheep nationally. During the past 10 years, the Sioux Falls stockyards handled 16,641,394 head of livestock. Adams-Dougherty Commission Co., is a registered market agency competing with eight other commission firms at Sioux Falls stockyards to secure the highest possible prices in selling farmers livestock. Our firm has sold about 2 million head of livestock since 1955.

It is an economic fact that terminal markets provide a useful, necessary function in the movement of livestock from producer to consumer at minimum costs. The cost (yardage and commission) at Sioux Falls is about 1¼ percent of gross sales.

In 1964 livestock was received at Sioux Falls from 12 different States while feeder livestock was shipped to 6 States. Slaughter livestock moved out to 82 packinghouses in 62 cities in 22 States.

Effectively functioning, the terminal market provides much more than selling or buying services. We maintain a strong, competitive market where the smaller and middle-size farmer can achieve better values for his livestock product.

Our market is vitally important to the economy of our farmers. In addition to our market selling and buying activities we offer experienced counseling services at the farm, such as help in securing feeder livestock, information on markets and trends, on types of feed, on shrink, etc. In other words, as commission men who strive to make our customers a more profitable operation of their business.

The questions of the livestock industry have been stated: loss of the farmer's bargaining power, vertical integration, decentralization, off-market buying, chain store meat profits, packer profits, etc.

Grade and yield selling and direct purchases are made under many different conditions and frequently the producer has no knowledge of all the factors involving the purchase of his livestock.

The terminal market might be considered the buffer between the seller and the buyer, whose interests are somewhat opposed. On livestock sales consummated strictly between the producer and packer, the producer is going to need more protection in the way of more uniformity and supervision of the packer's buying practices, better accountability.

The Packer and Stockyards Act certainly needs revision. If packers be required under a Federal livestock marketing order to purchase a predetermined percentage of their supplies from a federally licensed, supervised market in open competition, many producer problems could be answered.

Packers are concentrating on buying livestock direct at the farms. The producer cannot compete equally with a packer buyer. If the terminal market were eliminated from the scene, there would be nothing to prevent the livestock producer from being a captive to the packer in his own trade area. Direct buying is a threat to markets, whether terminal, auction markets or livestock concentration points. The interests of both packer and producer are not always compatible and it would be a confused situation if the information, guidance and selling service of the commission agent were absent.

Costs to the packer of buying direct are greater than his costs of procurement on the terminal market. A comparison of buyers salaries and fringe benefits reveals that packers stressing direct buying pay much more than those packers more closely associated with terminal market purchasing. Some data on this point is available.

The USDA states that the farmers' share of the consumers' food dollar has dropped from 51 percent in 1947 to 37 percent in 1964. The consumer has been paying more for food and the farmer receiving less. Wage rates and fringe benefits to labor are up sharply. In 1947 the average common laborer at Armour's plant in Omaha was paid $1.02 an hour. By 1963 the rate was $2.72 an hour for wages and $1.12 for fringe benefits to total $3.84 per hour—an increase of 276 percent in 15 years.

Concerning direct buying—I quote from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Marketing Service 1960 Outlook Issue of the "Marketing and Transportation Situation" that "one of the principal reasons why chains have adopted direct buying is that it gives them greater control over their supply."

The meeting of buyers and sellers at properly regulated competitive markets makes possible the flow of livestock from sales agency to the competitive purchaser with ease. Consider this example on the New York or American Stock Exchange. The reason that some 1,200 companies list their stocks on the New York Stock Exchange is because they know their listing will provide a sales center which will bring the highest possible price obtainable because most competition is available. This gentlemen, cannot help but be true in the livestock industry also.

To cope with marketing deterrents we suggest formulating specific educational marketing guideline data or rules which will provide, for all livestock producers, information setting forth every variable. The guideline data should be prepared by marketing industry representatives who know the score and in conjunction with officials of the Packers and Stockyards Division, U.S. Department of Agriculture. For authoritatives and meaningful presentation, this data should be illustrated, published, and distributed throughout the nation by officials of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The industry today needs a definite set of guidelines or rules on livestock marketing from a U.S. Department of Agriculture source which will set forth for the livestock producer and feeder, complete information on all variables of marketing. I repeat again, these guidelines or rules for authoritative and meaningful purpose, should be presented, published, and illustrated and thoroughly discussed throughout the nation by representatives of the Packers and Stockyards Division.

Thank you.

THE COUNTRY THAT WANTED LOVE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by Arthur Hoppe, and published in the Washington Star of June 16. Mr. Hoppe has written in an interesting and provocative manner about a serious matter.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, June 16, 1965]

THE COUNTRY THAT WANTED LOVE

(By Arthur Hoppe)

Once upon a time there was a big, warm, wonderful country. It had towering mountains and shining rivers and fruitful plains and lots and lots of very nice people. It was truly a wonderful country. And what it wanted most of all was to be loved.

Like many countries, it had been a bit of a bully at times while growing up. It had picked on smaller countries and pushed weaker people around and even, on occasion, broken its promises. But now that it was full grown, it didn't want to grow any more. And now that it was rich and powerful, it didn't want to push anybody around any more. It just wanted to be loved.

Probably no country ever cared more what other countries thought of it. In order to be loved, it did all sorts of nice things. It gave poorer countries lots of money. It gave weaker peoples lots of help. Above all, it was a very moral country. It never told lies and it always kept its promises. Which is very important if you wish to be loved.

Oddly enough, it was loved. Oh, some older countries said laughingly that it was little naive and unsophisticated. And some younger countries said enviously it was little vain and insensitive. But most people thought it was truly a pretty wonderful country. And to many it represented, in quite a real sense, the hope of a better world.

But, of course, now that the wonderful country was rich and strong and full grown, it had to go out and deal with other countries as an equal. It found that other countries sometimes told lies. And sometimes broke their promises. And were always trying to push you around. In fact, it was kind of a dog-eat-dog world.

At first, the wonderful country said this was awful. It would, it said, devote itself to making this a better world by "winning the battle for men's minds." It would teach people to be good by its shining example. And it would never tell lies, break promises, or push people around. Because that was the best way to make a better world.

But this proved very difficult. And pretty soon, as the wonderful country grew older, it began telling little lies. Like, "That wasn't our spy plane flying over your country." And it began to break its promises. Like, "We pledge never to interfere in the affairs of our neighbors." And it began to push people around.

At first, because it still wanted to be loved, the wonderful country tried to justify what it did.

"Golly," it said, "sometimes even we have to lie a little and cheat a little, but it's in a good cause. And when we send our soldiers into other countries, we're doing it for their sakes, not for ours."

But this proved difficult, too. And it became clear the wonderful country would have to choose between being loved and pushing people around. It did. It said, "What's so great about being loved? Who gives a fig what others think? It's a dog-eat-dog world and we've got to be hard-nosed realists and act in our own self-interest."

Which worked fine. Because when you act in your own self-interest, you can lie and cheat and push people around all you want.

Moreover, with its shining rivers and fruitful plains and nice people, it was still a wonderful country. Of course, it wasn't the hope of the world any more.

Moral: If you have a neighbor who says he doesn't give a fig what other people think of him, count your silverware.

THE OAS IN SANTO DOMINGO

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the entire world has its eyes on the Dominican Republic, and is waiting and hoping that the OAS will be successful as it seeks a peaceful solution of the crisis that has shaken that small island nation.

President Johnson averted much bloodshed by landing American troops in that strife-torn land. Now, however, American troops are being withdrawn as the OAS develops its inter-American force.

Recent editorials published in the Washington Post and the New York World-Telegram and Sun are typical of the support the President is receiving from the Nation's press. I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 4, 1965]

THE OAS PEACE MISSION

The new OAS peace team which has left for Santo Domingo has a mission of great importance to the whole Western Hemisphere. Not only the future of the Dominican Republic but also the evolution of the American peace system will be influenced by its work. Officially this three-man body has been assigned the task of collaborating with OAS Secretary General Jose A. Mora in seeking a peaceful solution of the Dominican crisis. But it also reflects a broader hope that ways can be found to help small, volatile countries in this hemisphere in the achievement of stability, peace, and freedom.

President Johnson made it clear in his news conference the other day that the United States has no interest in imposing any particular kind of regime on the Dominican people. The interest of this country in our small Caribbean neighbor is not imperialistic. Rather the aim of this country and the other American governments which have joined in sending a peace mission to Santo Domingo is to arrest the spread of chaos and the threat of communism and to keep the door open to Dominican control over Dominican affairs.

The task of the mission would be a simple one if the hostile Dominican factions were disposed to forget the past and cooperate in a provisional government which could prepare the way for fair elections. But nothing approaching a consensus on the composition of such a government has emerged. Unless some understanding can be worked out, it may be necessary for the OAS to conduct an early election or plebiscite to ascertain the will of the people. Certainly the peace mission will have to let the factions know in no uncertain terms that the issues between them must be settled by ballots rather than bullets.

If a democratic and stable government can be established in Santo Domingo with the aid of the peace mission, it will be an event of truly great significance. We do not minimize the difficulties that will be encountered in reconciling hostilities, satisfying constitutional requirements, and conducting an election free from violence, intimidation, and fraud. It is a challenge of immense proportions. But it is also a rare opportunity to point the way toward a new dimension in mutual helpfulness among the American Republics.

[From the New York (N.Y.) World-Telegram and Sun, June 3, 1965]

THE OAS IN SANTO DOMINGO

In the Dominican Republic the first job was to stop the fighting and assure the safety of all Dominicans, as well as others present.

The second job is to get the country's economy working again and then to arrange for elections at which the Dominicans can decide how they wish to proceed.

Meanwhile, some type of temporary administration has to be in effect.

On all these points, constructive progress seems to be underway, although slowly.

There still is some sniping, off and on, but the inter-American force under Gen. Huga Panasco Alvim, of Brazil, is taking charge and the United States has been able to withdraw several thousand troops. More should come home as Alvim decides.

The United States has poured money, food and medical supplies into the country and the Organization of American States, through the industrious efforts of Secretary General Jose A. Mora, is working on economic recovery.

The OAS has voted to send a team of three ambassadors (from El Salvador, Brazil, and the United States) to help Mora with the political problems. While both sides in the revolution have complained about Mora, they may yet agree to OAS supervision of the eventual free elections—the only way, under the circumstances, the elections can be assured of being free.

The OAS even has persuaded the leaders of the military junta to promise that none of them will run in the elections.

Both sides in the civil war probably will continue to drag their heels whenever they

can, but firm action by the OAS gradually will overcome that handicap. At the moment, even though the situation remains serious and difficult, the prospects are brighter than might have been expected a few days ago when confusion was in command.

For this, on reflection, we can thank the original decisiveness of President Johnson in sending U.S. troops—which undoubtedly prevented an even worse slaughter of Dominicans than occurred. And the patience and persistence of Mora and his OAS associates in negotiating the understandings now seemingly being achieved.

THE WASHINGTON, D.C., MEETING ON OCEAN SCIENCE AND OCEAN ENGINEERING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, a most outstanding 4-day meeting has just concluded here in Washington. The meeting was remarkable for two reasons: first, it was concrete evidence of a great surge of activity in a field of primary importance for all Americans; and, second, because in spite of its significance, it passed almost unnoticed.

The meeting was on the subject of ocean science and ocean engineering, with dual sponsorship by the Marine Technology Society and the American Society of Limnology and Oceanography.

The Marine Technology Society is new—less than a year old. Its remarkable growth and achievement in less than a year are a tribute to its officers and directors, but—even more important—also to the fact that it has filled an important void in national organization, by providing an organization and forum for those who are concerned, not solely with obtaining knowledge from the seas, but with putting that knowledge to use in practical engineering terms.

The American Society of Limnology and Oceanography has a longer, but equally successful, history, and is devoted to the advancement of science in these fields. Perhaps some Senators find "limnology" a new word, as I did.

It is perhaps most conveniently defined by simply stating that a limnologist is to fresh water what an oceanographer is to salt water.

The chairman of the joint conference was the distinguished former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, and chairman of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography, Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., now president of the Scientific Engineering Institute.

The meeting was significant because it provided a meeting ground for scientists, engineers, and managers from the academic world, from private industry, and from Government. The subjects ranged from detailed studies of a single aspect of science or technology, such as "Variability in Marine Benthic Communities off Georgia" and "A Free Diving Oceanography Buoy," to broad topics, ranging from an assessment of mineral resources of the sea to a full day's discussion of the role of nuclear energy in the sea.

It was my privilege to be invited to participate in a panel discussion, on Wednesday evening, on "Organization of Oceanography and Ocean Engineering in the United States." My fellow panelists included such distinguished scientists as Dr. Roger Revelle, of the Harvard Center for Population Studies, who has been director of the famed Scripps Oceanographic Institute, and scientific adviser to the Secretary of the Interior; Dr. Paul Fye, director of the equally famous Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute; and Dr. Wilbert Chapman, of the Van Camp Foundation. Industry was represented by Capt. H. A. Arnold, of United Aircraft Corp.; and David Potter, director of the General Motors Defense Laboratories. Other panelists were Representative PAUL ROGERS, of Florida, an articulate and informed champion of a forward-looking, national program for development of the oceans; and Dr. Wakelin. The moderator was one of the most energetic and imaginative men of my acquaintance—the distinguished scientist and engineer, Dean Athelstan Spilhaus, of the University of Minnesota.

A great deal of the discussion centered on the role of the Federal Government in ocean development; and when my own time came for a summation and final comment, I asked for a show of hands from those supporting each of three points of view that had been expressed during the evening:

First. No further action by the Government is necessary, in addition to that already being taken.

Second. A self-liquidating commission should be established of a composition that would enjoy the confidence of the Executive, Congress, industry, and the academic community. The commission would be charged with proposing a national policy in ocean development, together with the plans and suggested organization for carrying it out.

Third. The Government should move at once to establish an appropriate agency or other entity for ocean development.

I should note that the second proposition is consistent with a bill introduced in the other House by Representative Rogers, and the third is consistent with a bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. In my view, the two approaches are not at all incompatible. Among the attendees, there seemed to be a substantial body of opinion that the kind of entity proposed by Senator MAGNUSON was realistic, coupled with a view that the step proposed by Representative ROGERS was a desirable preliminary, in order to refine definitions, problems, and the role of the organization to be created.

On the show of hands, only a sprinkling of attendees—about 10—expressed the view that government need not take further action. The majority preferred the establishment of a commission or other study group, representative of all major constituents of an ocean program, to conduct a preliminary examination in depth, and to make recommendations for a positive policy and for an action program. Those who preferred immediate establishment of a new Federal agency for ocean development were a close second in number.

I do not regard any of this as definitive, but I think it is indicative of a lively interest in the future of the oceans. If there was a single point of consensus, it was that America must move forward in ocean development, and that this is a joint responsibility of Government at all levels, industry, and the academic community.

It is also important to note that several discussants sounded a note of caution, as follows: We should not move forward without first defining our goals and examining all the implications of those goals. Vast as the seas may be, they are not an endless resource, unless husbanded. We must be not only energetic and skillful, but also wise in our approach to the coming age of ocean development. We must foresee the consequences of our actions.

My own views on this point are clear. It was with this cautionary approach in mind that, on May 7, I spoke to the Senate about the possible establishment of sea-grant colleges. We did not know how to use the land profitably for agriculture until the great age of agricultural development in science and technology was spearheaded by the mixed scientific and technological approach of the agricultural institutions. I believe—and many of the others present at the meeting seemed to agree—that we must create a similar mechanism for the transfer of knowledge into practical applications, before we can exploit the oceans in a similar productive manner, while maintaining the principles of conservation.

Within a short time, I intend to introduce proposed legislation designed to meet this need. Meanwhile, my own State of Rhode Island already is looking ahead, thanks to the foresight, skill, and imagination of our own land-grant college, the University of Rhode Island, in developing courses in ocean science and engineering specifically designed to meet the State and national need.

VIETNAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the situation in Vietnam continues to require calm and deliberate patience and perseverance on the part of the people of the United States, as we continue to give our aid and assistance against aggression which threatens the people and security of the world.

Recently, Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY made at the National War College an outstanding speech in which he called for patience and persistence on the part of all Americans, and said:

> Liberals must learn that there are times when American power must be used, and that there is no substitute for power in the face of a determined terrorist attack. Conservatives must learn that in defeating a Communist insurgency, the use of military power can be counterproductive without accompanying political effort and the credible promise to the people of a better life.

In a speech last week at Michigan State University, the Vice President dealt with the "curious misconception" that the Vietcong are a purely idealistic movement, not living on fear and terrorism.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on these two speeches by the Vice President, published in the Baltimore Sun on Monday, June 7, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TERRORISM

Vice President HUMPHREY suggested last week, in a speech at the National War College, that liberals and conservatives should modify their traditional positions on the use of military power to help weak or struggling nations to defend their independence against Communist subversion and attack. "Liberals," he said, "must learn that there are times when American power must be used, and that there is no substitute for power in the face of a determined terrorist attack. Conservatives must learn that in defeating a Communist insurgency the use of military power can be counterproductive without accompanying political effort and the credible promise to the people of a better life."

The Vice President was emphasizing, as he said, that Communist terrorism cannot be defeated "by good works alone, or by good intentions, or by slogans, or by propaganda alone." He said further that Americans must learn to be patient—"the Communists are very patient"—and must learn to persist, because the Communists are persistent, too.

"We must learn to adapt our military planning and tactics to the new conditions of Communist warfare," Mr. HUMPHREY added, "and we must learn to coordinate military efforts, propaganda, effective political organizational efforts and economic investments far better than we have done so far."

In another speech last week, made at Michigan State University, the Vice President dealt with what he called the "curious misconception" that in Vietnam the Vietcong is a great idealistic movement with some resemblance, for example, to the American Populist Party. In fact, however, he said the Vietcong has made its gains in South Vietnam largely from terrorism. Arthur Schlesinger, whose own qualifications as an American liberal are as authentic as Mr. HUMPHREY'S, said the Vietcong's gains "have come in the main not from the hopes they have inspired but from the fear they have created." Agricultural stations have been destroyed, medical clinics raided, malaria control teams killed or kidnaped. Since 1954, according to estimates cited by Mr. HUMPHREY, more than 10,000 civilian officials have been killed or kidnaped.

These comments on the war in Vietnam are worth keeping in mind as the news dispatches describe the fighting and as the discussion of our policy continues in the United States.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, an editorial entitled "The Great Paradox," published in the New York Herald Tribune on June 6, points up some of the facts of our changing world concerning our relationship with the Soviet Union and Red China. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREAT PARADOX

President Johnson calls on the Soviet Union to join the United States in works of peace, while evidence accumulates that Russian guns and planes are moving into North Vietnam. The Soviet Union complains that Johnson talks peace while bombing a Communist country.

The situation is paradoxical. But the contradictory elements in the two national positions are real. There is no reason to doubt that both Washington and Moscow would prefer more stable relations with one another—and there is equally no reason to question the reality of the clash in Vietnam. The United States is deeply committed there; so is the Soviet Union. Americans had hoped that the Russians would use their influence to end the intervention of the North Vietnamese in South Vietnam; Russians want the Americans to pull out.

Vietnam is not the only corner of the earth in which American and Soviet interests clash, nor does either nation make any particular secret of the fact that the Russians want communism to spread and the Americans want it to roll back. But what was once a worldwide confrontation, with dangers of overt hostility at every point on the periphery of Communist power, has altered profoundly. Much of the frontier symbolized by the Iron Curtain has been stabilized; the curtain itself has been perforated in spots, with trade and communication barriers lowered. Berlin and Cuba are peril points, but even there the dangers are likely to spring more from the ambitions of Castro or the fears of the East German Communists than from the Soviet leadership.

This lessening of many acute tensions could lead, not to a firm peace (for the political and economic systems of East and West are still too far apart for that) but to a kind of modus vivendi, an agreement to disagree, that would permit a far more normal life for both superpowers, as well as for the nations that live in their neighborhood. But—there is also Red China.

Mao's China is all that the Soviet Union was in the days when Stalin ruled over a nation, victorious in war but gravely damaged by it. Peiping has many material wants, plus the consciousness of having survived a great ordeal, proud, secretive, suspicious, aggressive. It proclaims permanent revolution, expands its empire, and adds to this explosive mixture a racialist aspect that finds appreciative echoes in many of the new nations.

To this hungry predator, the Soviet Union—whose people are intensely desirous of enjoying the fruits of their own long and bloody struggle—is linked by ideological ties. The fact that Red China has made the United States its great foe, the symbol of all that is evil in the world, the enemy against which it unites its people virtually from the cradle, is Moscow's prime embarrassment in seeking any accommodation on any subject with Washington.

The Soviet leadership hopes to avoid a choice; it would like the United States, by bowing out of Vietnam, to make one unnecessary. But even that would not solve the Moscow-Peiping problem. For sooner or later the choice will be forced on Moscow—perhaps not over Vietnam, possibly not over any matter in which the United States is directly concerned. Because it is really Russia, not America, that China is contending with even now.

THE WHITE HOUSE FESTIVAL OF THE ARTS, AND THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, thanks to the leadership and understanding of President and Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson, June 14, 1965, was a day deeply significant to our Nation's cultural progress and growth. On that day, the White House festival of the arts was held. It was a festival of unprecedented scope, and demonstrated not only the great variety of our country's artistic talent, but also this administration's desire to help foster, in every appropriate way, excellence in the arts.

The program was most comprehensive, and gave fitting emphasis to the broad spectrum of the arts: poetry, prose, drama, dance, music—both instrumental and vocal—painting, sculpture, photography, and the arts of the motion pictures.

Mrs. Johnson was a particularly gracious hostess to the more than 400 guests; and in her opening remarks she set the tone for this remarkable event when she called it a day of feasting for the eyes, ears, and minds of those who participated.

As the President said in his address of welcome to the artists assembled:

You seek out the common pleasures and visions, terrors, and cruelties of man's day on this planet. You help dissolve the barriers of hatred and ignorance which are the source of so much pain and danger. In this way you work toward peace which liberates man to reach for the finest fulfillment of his spirit.

Other great American Presidents have spoken eloquent words in behalf of our Nation's artists; but this was an occasion of unusual depth and magnitude, representing our past achievements in the arts, as well as contemporary works of importance.

As chairman of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities, I pay special tribute to the President and to Mrs. Johnson for so splendidly bringing to the White House the wide diversity of our creative talents; and I am very happy to note that just 4 days before the festival, the Senate passed the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965.

This bill contains the President's proposals for the Foundation. As I have said before, I believe the bill is the most comprehensive of its kind ever to come before Congress. Thus, the concepts of the festival and those of the Foundation are in close and meaningful harmony. Both are, indeed, unique in the history of our country.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River Basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; and

H.R. 485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 3165) to authorize the

establishment of the Pecos National Monument in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred or placed on the calendar, as follows:

H.R. 237. An act to make certain provisions in connection with the construction of the Garrison diversion unit, Missouri River basin project, by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 485. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom south unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; placed on the calendar.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTION ACT OF 1965—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PELL in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of today.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have the honor to bring before the Senate the conference report on H.R. 8371, the Excise Tax Reduction Act of 1965.

This is the bill that only the day before yesterday was passed by the Senate. I think you can see from this that the conferees acted with expedition. In fact I might take time to point out that the whole handling of this bill, I believe, sets some kind of a record for quick action. It was exactly 1 month ago today, on May 17, that the President first sent to Congress his recommendations for excise tax reductions.

This is an indication of the speed with which Congress can act on tax legislation when there is a need to do so. All of us were aware of the fact that any delay in action on our part might affect the economy through the delay of purchases of the taxed articles by consumers. In my view, this demonstrates, and demonstrates quite clearly, that when there is general agreement in Congress that a tax reduction is needed, this action can be taken—in the regular legislative manner in a very short period of time.

The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, does not depart to any appreciable extent from the bill as passed by the Senate the day before yesterday. This is indicated by the fact that the bill as initially passed by the Senate would, over a 4-year period, have reduced excise tax collections by $4,658 million. The bill, as agreed to by the conferees, is a reduction of $4,676 million which constitutes a difference of only $18 million from the bill passed by the Senate 2 days ago.

Actually, there are 108 numbered amendments in this bill. However, most of these are in the clarifying or conforming categories. In terms of substantive amendments, I count 29 amendments. However, of these, eight represent minor technical amendments recommended by the Treasury staff and our own technical tax staff. Apart from these, of the remaining 21, the conferees for the House receded on 13, 3 with significant amendments. The Senate conferees receded on eight.

Of all of the amendments, I would classify five as the most significant.

Two of these dealt with the manufacturers' excise tax on automobiles. As Senators will recall, the bill reduces this tax to 7 percent this month and then to 6 percent on next January 1. On January 1, 1967, the Senate version of the bill would reduce the tax to 5 percent and then on the following two January 1's, 1968 and 1969, there would be two additional reductions of 2 percentage points. Thus, the Senate would retain a tax of 1 percent at all times. The House would remove this tax entirely. This 1 percentage point under the Senate version of the bill would be set aside by the Senate bill in a special fund to aid in the disposal of old and wrecked automobiles.

In addition, 4 percentage points of the reduction in the tax on passenger cars was made contingent, in the Senate version of the bill, by the Ribicoff amendment, upon cars meeting the same safety standards as are required by the General Services Administration with respect to cars purchased by the Federal Government.

The House conferees, although we urged them earnestly to accept the amendment relating to car safety, refused to do so.

The conferees debated the amendment for more than an hour. We did not agree. We took a recess and then debated it again. We proposed a compromise. However, the House was absolutely adamant on this amendment.

They made it clear that in resisting this amendment they were not opposing these standards of car safety as such, but rather objected to their being made a condition to a tax reduction. They seemed to believe that if action was taken in this respect, it should be taken directly by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and the Senate Committee on Commerce. For that reason we had accede to the House in this regard.

With respect to the 1 percentage point set aside for old and wrecked automobiles, the House agreed to retain this 1 percentage point of tax. They refused, however, to earmark it in a fund for the disposal of old and wrecked automobiles. This, of course, does not mean that this 1 percentage point—or, for that matter, the other 4 points not to be repealed until after 1967—cannot be used to meet problems raised by automobiles. This amount, for the present, will remain in the general fund revenue. This, of course, will not at some future time foreclose the allocation of this amount to the problems raised by automobiles, whether for safety, for the disposal of old cars, or other problems related to automobiles.

It will be recalled that the Senate version of the bill moved up the effective date for the reductions which, under the House bill, were scheduled for July 1, 1965. The Senate version of the bill provided that all of the retailers' taxes which are repealed, all of the manufacturers' taxes scheduled for repeal or reduction on July 1, and the playing card tax, instead of being repealed on July 1, are to be repealed on the day after the day the bill is signed by the President. The House agreed to this amendment and, therefore, the effective dates of these reductions will be the day after the bill is signed. I believe it is clear that this bill will be presented for signature to the President within the next few days.

Mr. President, I am somewhat embarrassed by a report that appears in the press. I am not certain whether the reporter who reported the statement heard it accurately. He said that the Senator from Louisiana said that the President would sign the bill on Friday.

As a practical matter, a suggestion had been made by the executive branch that the conferees should undertake to tell the President when he should sign the bill. The conferees unanimously agreed that it was none of our business to tell the President when he should sign the bill. That is his privilege. [Laughter.] He does not even have to sign it; he can veto it if he wishes to do so. That is purely a matter within his discretion. But somehow the press misunderstood the junior Senator from Louisiana. All I said was that if the President wanted to do so, he could sign the bill on Friday. I hope that that will straighten out the problem, because it has caused some misunderstanding between the executive and legislative branches of the Government.

I call the attention of the retail and wholesale trades to the fact that these reductions are about to occur and that if they hope to obtain floor stock refunds for their inventories on hand on the tax elimination date, they must be prepared to take these inventories as soon as the President signs the bill.

That is perhaps the reason why the President might delay signing the bill for a few days, in order to give retailers a chance to take inventory. It would be fine with this Senator if the President were to sign the bill on Friday so that the tax cut would go into effect on Saturday. In that way, everyone selling cuff links, cologne, men's perfume, or television sets could advertise, "Buy a television set for daddy on Father's Day." [Laughter.]

It would seem to me that would be a fine way to do it and to stop the buyer's strike. However, that is up to the President. One way would favor the retailer and the other way would favor the kids. The President will make that decision.

A fourth substantive amendment made by the Senate related to the tax on lubricating oil. The Senate bill would have restored the present tax law of 3 cents a gallon on cutting oil and 6 cents a gallon on other lubricating oil. The House bill to which your conferees have agreed in this area, would have eliminated all of the tax on lubricating oil and cutting oil—either by exemption or refund procedure—except in the case of lubricating oil used in highway vehicles. The 3-cent-a-gallon tax on cutting oil under the House bill is eliminated entirely. The 6-cent tax on other lubricating oil would under the House bill, apply generally, but refunds would be available for nonhighway use. Additionally, the House bill would allocate tax collected on lubricating oil to the highway trust fund.

The House conferees felt quite strongly that the $50 million a year from highway use of lubricating oil should be allocated to the highway trust fund. Your conferees, after much discussion on this point, finally agreed to the retention of the tax on lubricating oil insofar as it relates to highway use and for its allocation to the highway trust fund.

This Senator detected that there was considerable sentiment in the House to accept the amendment. It would have taken the 1 percentage point retained by the Douglas amendment and placed it in the highway trust fund to guarantee the completion of highways on schedule. That would have been subject to a point of order by any Member of the House.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a point of order would most certainly have been raised if the 1 percent had been placed in the highway trust fund by the conferees.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was the point that was made. We had to recognize the validity of it. We did not do that. We saved that 1 percentage point of tax for revenue purposes. Congress can decide in the future how it wants it to be used. The House is not necessarily opposed to using this. They believe that if it should be done, it ought to be done by other committees, and not by the Committee on Ways and Means or by the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator advise me whether the conference report contains an exemption to a lottery?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A Senate amendment provided that a State-owned sweepstake, which is related specifically to the State-owned sweepstake in New Hampshire, would not be subject to the gaming tax.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, does the Senator think it makes any difference whether a State or an individual gambles, or whether the State encourages individuals to gamble?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was the decision of the Senate. The Senate voted on that.

As the Senate conferees, it was our duty to urge the House to accept it.

Parimutuels have always been exempted from the tax on gambling. For example, we have two horseracing tracks in the New Orleans vicinity. One is in the city itself and the other is in Jefferson Parish. They are specifically exempt from the tax on gambling.

Mr. MORSE. On the ground that they are a necessity?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not say that they are a necessity, but they were not regarded as being the kind of corrupt operation that the Kefauver committee referred to when it recommended this kind of legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Could it be on the ground that they are a great educational institution for improving the morals of the young?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. They are taxed under State laws. Louisiana gets quite a bit of money from the racetracks. The city of New Orleans finds it to be a very important item of revenue.

The same situation exists in Maryland. There are three racetracks, as I recall. There are two racetracks in West Virginia, to my knowledge. Those are not taxed. Those are private operations. They are not taxed by the Federal Government. They are all taxed, so far as I know, by the State. They are taxed rather heavily.

The money derived from the tax from New Hampshire is used exclusively for education. Insofar as I know, a record was made when the amendment was offered by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] and his colleague the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON].

They made their case. I would urge the Senator to look at the record. The amendment was objected to by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. However, it was debated and was agreed to on a voice vote.

The House felt that in view of the fact that it was entirely a State-owned operation, and that all of the revenue went to education, without any indication that there is any improper use or control of the operation, it would be all right.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana of course understands that the Senator from Oregon is not reflecting on the Senator from Louisiana. However, I do mean to reflect on Congress.

I think it is inescapable that we are adding another exemption—from another source of immorality in our country—to taxes.

Does the Senator believe that if Congress were to legalize immoral houses, some people would say that the income from that source—because it would go to the education of the young—would justify exempting them?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That would be a better use for the money than the use that some of it is being used for now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, we are dealing with a basic question of morals. I am at a complete loss to understand why we give such an operation a tax benefit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I understand the argument of the Senator. I am sure that some agree with him.

I am glad to report that the fifth substantive amendment made by the Senate; namely, the repeal of the 10-cent-per-pound tax on manufactured tobacco—that is, smoking and chewing tobacco, and snuff—was agreed to by the conferees of the other body. As a result, this tax is repealed as of January 1, 1966. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, the distinguished Senator from Virginia, was most effective in persuading the House to agree to this amendment.

In the area of floor stock refunds, the House accepted the two amendments in the Senate bill providing for floor stock refunds; namely, those applicable in the case of playing cards and sporting goods. However, the House conferees refused to go along with the action taken by the Senate in removing the floor stock refund on auto parts and accessories. The wholesalers and retailers in all three of these industries apparently desire floor stock refunds and, therefore, the conferees have agreed to them.

Two other amendments made by the Senate relate to the documentary stamp taxes. First, we would have postponed for 3 years the effective date of the repeal of the tax on real estate conveyances. We believe that this was desirable because the States and local governments depend upon these stamps on real estate conveyances for assessment purposes. Therefore, we were giving the States and local governments an opportunity to impose these taxes if they so desired. The House conferees agreed to this amendment but provided a 2-year, rather than a 3-year, postponement. Thus, this tax will go off on January 1, 1968, rather than January 1, 1969.

The House conferees unfortunately refused, and adamantly refused to accept the second amendment relating to the documentary stamp taxes. This amendment would have advanced by 1 day—to December 31, 1965—the date for the repeal of the documentary stamp taxes on securities.

Other amendments accepted by the House conferees include the following:

First. The amendment relating to light bulbs incorporated as parts in refrigerators, ranges, radios, television sets, and other taxed articles. The tax on these items is removed this June, but the tax on light bulbs remains until January 1, 1966. The Senate amendment prevented the initiation of a new tax on the bulbs incorporated in these appliances merely for this 6-month interval. The House agreed to this amendment.

Second. Another amendment, offered by Senator DIRKSEN, on the floor, would make the club dues tax inapplicable to initiation fees incurred after June 30 in the case of new clubs going into operation after that date. This was necessary to make it possible for new clubs to operate in this period. The House agreed to this amendment.

Third. The House agreed to all of the amendments the Senate made with respect to the tax on truck bodies and truck parts. It agreed that the so-called camper coaches and bodies of mobile homes should not be included in this tax base. It agreed that truck bodies, parts, and accessories primarily designed for use in connection with the processing, holding, or spreading of feed, seed, or fertilizer in connection with a farming activity should not be subject to the truck tax. It agreed to exclude from this tax 3-wheeled motor vehicles powered by a motor which does not exceed 18 brake horsepower if the chassis does not weigh over 1,000 pounds. It agreed to the matter with which Senator JACKSON is concerned; namely, that the sales price on which the truck tax is based should not include the value of used parts furnished by the customer for incorporation in a truck to be used by him. It agreed that the rebuilding of auto parts is not to be considered as manufacturing for purposes of the exemption from tax on sales of new parts incorporated in the rebuilt parts. It was *agreed to exempt* from tax schoolbuses sold to private operators if the buses are to be used only for school purposes, except for incidental use by certain nonprofit organizations.

Fourth. The House agreed to the amendment redefining uninterrupted international air transportation in the case of members of the Armed Forces to exclude from tax for trips where reaching the United States the servicemen purchases a standby ticket for the remaining portion of his trip within 6 hours and takes the first available accommodation.

Fifth. The House conferees accepted the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Delaware exempting from income tax nonprofit poultry growers exchanges. However, it limited this exemption to past periods and left open for study the application in the future.

Sixth. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment exempting from seizure by the Internal Revenue Service undelivered mail. It amended this provision, however, to make it inapplicable after the mail has been delivered to the addressee.

That was a point that was raised on the floor by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. The House makes clear that the possible abuses contemplated or suggested by the Senator from Tennessee would not occur.

Seventh. The House conferees accepted the Senate amendment exempting from the wagering tax those wagers placed in State-run sweepstakes, pools, and lotteries. This is the amendment having particular application to New Hampshire.

The House conferees were unwilling to accept the amendment which provides for refunds of taxes paid on gasoline held by a dealer where the gasoline is lost by leakage or spillage. They were also unwilling to accept the amendment which would impose the tax on tires at the time of the delivery of the tires to the retail outlet where the manufacturer owns these outlets. These two amendments primarily were not adopted because of the belief that they required more consideration than it was possible to accord them at this time.

With regard to the particular amendment relating to manufactured tires in the hands of independent dealers, in my judgment it was a very meritorious amendment. The objection on the part of the House managers was not that they did not consider the amendment meritorious. Their objection was that they had sent a bill to the Senate several times to that effect and the Senate had not acted on it. Due to pride of authorship, Members of the House thought that those who had labored so hard in the vineyard should get some credit for it, rather than put this provision in the bill as a Senate amendment.

I hope we can have action on that issue at this session. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was the sponsor of the amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I have no pride of authorship, even though the House apparently has. If the House will send us the bill again, so it can take credit for it, I will gladly support it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a good piece of legislation, and should be agreed to.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the only way to get good legislation enacted is by the House getting credit for it, I am in favor of having the House get credit for it. If this is the only way we can make progress, I am willing to conform to that rule.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That is a most generous attitude and it is characteristic of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. But the House did not include this provision which I sponsored in the excise tax bill. Therefore, it must have been in the past when the House did approve such legislation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. Members of the House referred to past years.

I very much hope that the House will send us a bill with this provision. I hope the Senator from Illinois will join the author of the measure in the House so that he may at least have the distinction of being a coauthor of the measure. All the House has to do is say "Yes," and it would be the law some time next week.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I shall be glad to cooperate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I regret very much that the House would not accept the amendment, but this is something that should be done in this session of Congress. It is a good amendment and should be agreed to.

Incidentally, if the Senator from Illinois should reintroduce the measure, he should have our staff technicians study it for him, because there are some technical drafting problems involved in it.

An amendment offered to this bill would have required the Council of Economic Advisers to report to the Congress with respect to the economic effects of the tax reductions or repeals made by this bill. This report was to have been made annually through July 1970.

The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers has stated that the issue of the extent to which the tax reductions are passed onto the consumers—referring to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON]—is an important question and essential to the economic benefit of the excise tax program. However, the Chairman indicates that this amendment is not needed, because some months ago in anticipation of the possible reduction of excise taxes the Council, the Treasury Department, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics agreed that it would be important to measure the impact of excise tax reductions on retail prices. As a result, they already have underway a substantial study that will measure—to the extent possible—the effects of excise tax cuts on prices paid by consumers. Chairman Ackley has assured me that the results of this study will be made public as they become available for the use of Congress and others who may be interested. In view of this, this last amendment was also deleted from the bill.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. NELSON. I am concerned about the extent and the depth of the study that will be made. Some time ago I wrote a letter to the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. I was conducting hearings on the impact of the expenditure of Federal research and development funds upon scientific and technical manpower in this country. I invited the Chairman to appear before the committee to give us the benefit of the Council's judgment on this matter. Among other things, he declined, saying:

> With our small staff and heavy burden of special assignments from the President it would be extremely difficult for us to comply with your request.

There were 15 professionals working there as of January 1965.

Mr. Ackley had delivered a speech as of the time this matter was pending, the day before we passed it.

I am concerned about this matter. The amendment directed the Council of Economic Advisers to make a study of the impact and report back at least once a year until 1970.

It gave a sum sufficient for the study. It was a study that was requested by Congress.

The executive branch has this responsibility. The congressional branch has its responsibility. I believe that we default in our responsibility if we do not request that the study be made for us and then, based on that study, conduct extensive hearings each year to find out whether we are satisfied with the study which has been made and its validity, to be sure we get an understanding of what the impact of the tax reduction has been. This reduction is not, as the Senator knows, an income tax cut which automatically goes to the taxpayer. I believe the Senator knows—and I appreciate very much his endorsement of the proposal yesterday, that I have no criticism whatsoever of the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill—that there is nothing automatic about the transference of the $4,700 million tax cut to the consumer.

If all manufacturers and all retailers do nothing, they will keep the $4,700 million. They will keep a great deal of this, despite the fact that the President has stated that the objective of the proposal is to reduce prices to the consumer and to expand his purchasing power.

It seems to me that we have a significant and fundamental responsibility to assure that this big tax cut does go to the consumer, and that we should not rely upon the executive agencies. The executive is one branch. We are another. They have their responsibilities. We have our responsibilities. It is unfortunate that we did not assume ours.

I ask the Senator from Louisiana, What guarantees are there, so far as he is concerned, that Congress will get the study it desires, and that it will get the complete study in depth, when Congress does not direct it in any way?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that I am not debating against his amendment. I agreed to accept the amendment. When there was opposition to it, I spoke in support of it. In conference I supported the amendment. We did not merely offer to surrender on the Senator's amendment. We did what we could to retain it. The House conferees contended—and they had the law on their side—that the Council of Economic Advisers does not advise Congress. It advises the President, and it does not wish its capacity changed. It is said that if anyone reported to us it should be the President.

I said, "Fine. Let us strike out 'Council of Economic Advisers,' and write in 'President'." It was said that that would be subject to a point of order, and so we said, "What can we do?" The Treasury comes forward and says, "We have a study going on, and the Council of Economic Advisers has already agreed that it will do its part of the study. Also, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which has the information in greater depth than any of us, is working on the same subject, and we are going to make the study and give it to you during 1966."

Then they go on to say that it is impossible, as late as 1970, to say what the tax cut had to do with prices in 1970, because we cannot trace the effect that far through. But, they say, "We can certainly trace it through 1966, and we will give Congress that information in even greater depth than the Nelson amendment requires. Therefore, in 1966, we will give Congress everything it is asking for through the Treasury, the Council of Economic Advisers, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics."

As the Senator knows, his amendment made no authorization for appropriations. It would have expected the available staffs to take care of it. I assume the Council of Economic Advisers will do the job.

Mr. NELSON. If I may interrupt, we provided for a sufficient sum.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I correctly recall, no additional money was appropriated, but the Bureau of Labor Statistics is where studies are made of all the cost of living items—what a family pays for everything, from bread to television. Therefore, we have some assurances that would cover a part of the problem.

With regard to certain items, and particularly the big ones, we have firm assurances from the manufacturers that they will do what is requested of them. For example, we have letters from all four of the major automobile companies firmly promising that they will pass these savings along to the consumer. The Senator will find that in Appendix A of the committee report. We have firm assurance from those companies, and we shall be making a study which will show whether they have kept their word or not.

In addition, only this afternoon I talked with a representative of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. He pointed out that in Louisiana alone—and I assume the same thing to be true in Wisconsin—if not, I know that we shall hear about it from the Senator from Wisconsin—that the telephone people feel that the tax reduction will mean a saving of $17 for the average telephone customer in the State of Louisiana. I presume about the same will be true in the State of Wisconsin. The telephone company is already preparing its publications to advertise and tell the people about the tax cut, and to express their gratitude to Congress on behalf of both the company and the user for the tax reduction voted by Congress.

Those are regulated companies, as the Senator from Wisconsin well knows. It is the duty of the State commissions and also of the Federal Communications Commission to see to it that the tax reductions are passed on to the consumer.

Let me say to the Senator that if he has difficulty attaining that objective, so far as I am concerned, he can be assured of my complete cooperation in assuring that the tax reductions on telephones will be passed along to the consumer.

Mr. NELSON. If I may interrupt again, let me say that I know the Senator from Louisiana has been the most vigorous spokesman, so far as I know, in the Congress on behalf of the consumer's rights respecting utilities. When the Senator states that these are regulatory agencies respecting prices which are to be paid by the consumer, I believe that the Senator knows better than anyone else that, without giving the figures, there are an astonishing number of regulatory agencies in this country in the back pockets of the utilities whom they are regulating. I would not wish to name the number, but it is incredible.

In Wisconsin, every time we get a conservative, such as the great and distinguished David Lilienthal, the consumer is protected. Then comes 20 years of Republican rule in the State and the consumer has no protection. I had the opportunity, as Governor, to make some appointments which got some protection back to the consumer. I believe that we have done better in Wisconsin than in most of the other States of the Union—perhaps better than any. But to leave this up to the public utility commissions in the States to protect the consumer's interests is preposterous.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be willing to wager, as one who sometimes bets on the outcome of elections, and one who sometimes bets on horses at the racetrack or parimutuel, from time to time—I am sort of behind this year, I went to the Preakness, to my regret—that the users of telephones in Wisconsin will receive the benefit of the tax cut, if for no other reason than that they have a vigorous and active Senator who will not be quiet if they fail to get the benefits.

Mr. NELSON. I am also interested in the 49 other States being protected. However, my point really is that it seems to me Congress has defaulted in its responsibility because of its failure to direct that a report be made to it and that hearings then be conducted on that report.

The executive branch might well be concerned about giving a detailed report on all the money that will be given back to the consumer. I notice that the law provides that any report given to Congress will go to the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It will be available to Congress. We shall get a report next year. Two committees can conduct hearings to see to it that a desirable result is had. One of the committees is the Joint Economic Committee, which is headed by the distinguished Representative from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN. No one has ever accused him of being a stooge of the vested interests. He is ably seconded on that committee by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS].

If the Senator from Wisconsin is not satisfied with that, we will investigate it in the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on Small Business, of which the Senator from Wisconsin is a member.

We will see to it, if he has any difficulty about it that he will be completely satisfied.

Mr. NELSON. If the Joint Economic Committee which is graced by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], has adequate funds for conducting hearings, I shall have complete confidence that we shall get a good report.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have been listening to the report of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I want to commend him for his masterful job of managing this measure. I want it understood that the remarks I am about to make in no way cast any aspersion or any implication of a negative nature upon the Senator from Louisiana or on any of the other Senate conferees.

I am deeply disturbed by the rejection of the safe car amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him, I was greatly disturbed by the rejection of that amendment. It was my great disappointment. I was deeply disappointed that we could not persuade the House conferees to agree to this major amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut.

The Senator is a very effective and valued Member both of the Committee on Finance and the Senate as a whole. In my judgment, the amendment was one of the best amendments in the bill

that was passed by the Senate. I was very much disappointed by the fact that we were not able to persuade more than one House conferee to agree with us.

The next time, when a major amendment like this is offered by the Senator from Connecticut, I should like to have the Senator from Connecticut made a member of the conference committee, even if it means that I would not be a member of it. He could take my seat. I was extremely disappointed that we could not retain the amendment. It was a very fine amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The RECORD should show that in the Committee on Finance the Senator from Louisiana, our chairman, the Senator from Virginia, and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], all voted for the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Probably the most significant amendment in the bill was another amendment also offered by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] to move up the effective date of the bill. As a result, the people of this Nation will get this refund, this tax break, at least 10 days sooner that they would have received it under the bill before the amendment of the Senator was added. It will help small business in this country. We are glad that we were able to persuade the House conferees to agree to the amendment.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I appreciate the compliment. However, with regard to the two amendments, I would have gladly changed the situation so that we could have kept the safe car amendment. The effective date amendment saves money. The safe car amendment would have saved lives. The rejection of the safe car amendment is more than unfortunate—it is tragic.

It is unfortunate because we have missed a real opportunity to pass on to the American people not only savings in terms of dollars and cents, but in terms of life and health as well.

It is tragic when we consider that one in five Americans will be killed or injured in traffic accidents during the next decade unless we act, and instead of acting we have substituted pious statements and meaningless pledges about "continued efforts to bring added safety to the highways through the development of steadily improved passenger cars and through other techniques as well."

Those are the words of the auto makers' group which has successfully lobbied to drop nine-tenths of the auto excise tax.

I reject this meaningless and oft-stated promise of the automakers, who have never given the American people the safe car they deserve. I reject the pious explanation of those who state they agree with the "objectives" of the safe car amendment but who feel the safety campaign should not be "hitched" to revenue legislation.

What would they hitch it to? The good intentions of the automakers who have ignored simple safety devices for the cars of today while trumpeting their meager research efforts on the car of tomorrow? What would they hitch it to? Legislation to force Detroit to safety? Legislation that has been before Congress for at least the past 6 years and no doubt many years before that?

Who are we kidding but ourselves with these good intention statements?

Let us face it. There is only one road to traffic safety. And that is to get tough. I learned as Governor of Connecticut that the "get tough" policy was the only language the driver understands. We got tough with the speeder, the drunk, the incompetent—and Connecticut's highway death rate fell to the lowest in the Nation.

That same get-tough policy applies to the automakers as well as the driver. From long experience I know that no voluntary program will ever work. As chairman of the Governor's Conference on Traffic Safety, we reached an agreement with Detroit regarding the emphasis on speed and horsepower in their advertising. That was in the late fifties. The agreement was breached in 1961–62. There is no way of maintaining a voluntary safety program with this industry. And tragically enough the current increase in the rate of highway deaths following a steady decline through the late fifties and early sixties corresponds exactly to the year the agreement was broken. At the current rate of increase highway deaths will total 100,000 in the year 1975. And yet today's advertising of cars blares louder than ever about speed and horsepower and "tigers" in the tank and behind the wheel.

To those concerned about the proprieties of tying car safety to the excise tax bill, I suggest they take a close look at highway death since 1960. In that year, 38,137 Americans lost their lives. In 1961, there was an actual decrease to 38,091. We were holding our own. Then the speed and horsepower agreement was ended. And the death rate soared to 40,804 in 1962, climbed to 43,564 in 1963 and has reached the fantastic figure of 48,000 in 1964.

To those who swallow Detroit's pious promises about voluntary action while their advertisements appeal to the very worst in the driver's human nature, let me cite a case reported by the automotive crash injury research program at Cornell University:

> A mother was driving with her infant daughter lying in the front seat. She glanced down to check the infant, and her car left the roadway; the human factor in the accident equation failed; and the first chance to prevent the accident was lost. The car continued a few feet, approached an abutment close to the road and unprotected by a suitable guardrail; and the road factor in the accident equation failed; and the second chance was lost. The last inch was traversed, the mother and child were thrown forward, the child struck the center panel area with her head, fell to the floor and died. Thus the vehicle factor in the accident equation failed, and the third chance for survival was lost.

Mr. President, I have maintained throughout this fight that the vehicle is only one factor. I do not place all the blame on the automakers. We need better drivers. We need better roads. But the traffic situation is such that accidents are unavoidable, often, and, in fact, inevitable. Therefore, the vehicle must be made on the assumption that the driver equation and the road equation might fail. In the case cited, a padded instrument panel could have been the difference between a headache and death. One of the safety standards provided in the safe car amendment was a padded dash.

So to those who await voluntary action from Detroit—to those who suggest more time and study—to those who put cost above all else—remember that the buttons, knobs, lines, and styles of today's cars will regularly be subjected to the test of being struck by an infant's head.

We have lost a battle, Mr. President, but the war against the carnage taking place on our roads and highways will continue. It is tragic that this opportunity has gone by the boards, but in spite of the action of the conferees we must continue our crusade to save the lives and health of the American people. As long as I am in the Senate, I shall continue this crusade and let the chips fall where they may.

I announce now for the attention of the Senate and other interested parties that I will resume hearings before my Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization studying the Federal role in traffic safety beginning July 13. I am today extending invitations to the presidents of General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, and American Motors to attend these hearings and explain what they have done, are now doing and plan for the future regarding automotive safety. I expect them to tell me not about the driver and his habits; not about the roads and their inadequacies; but about their product and what consideration they give in making it to the lives and property of the driver and his passengers. Let us bring the traffic safety problem out in the open. Let us face the fact that we have killed here at home 400 times more people in the past 4 years than we have lost in combat in southeast Asia in the same period. Let us start giving automobile safety to the American people. They have suffered enough from pious excuses—from broken pledges.

Mr. President, one of the great shames of modern society and industry is the failure of the automobile industry to put well-known, well-tested, and well-accepted safety standards into automobiles as standard equipment.

The fight is only started. It will be a sad day that the automobile industry fought the measure and prevented the House conferees from putting the provision into effect, because it could have rendered itself and America a great service. I know there are others, such as the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON] and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] who feel that way about it and who have fought this fight. We shall stay with the fight until the automobile manufacturers build a safe car for the people of America.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, everything the Senator has said is echoed in the heart of the Senator from Louisiana. He is as right as he can be on the question. In fairness to the House conferees, the attitude taken by the distinguished chairman of the conferees and by the majority of the House con-

ferees, all save one—even though, I am happy to say, the Senate conferees voted and fought for the Senate position—was that they did not believe we should be starting new Federal programs as a condition of tax policy.

That position, of course, is very much contrary to the attitude taken by the Senator from Connecticut on a number of questions. I do not agree with it, but I must respect the House conferees' right to maintain and to insist upon their position. They have been consistent in that.

Their attitude was that the merits of the proposal should be studied by the Committees on Commerce of the House and Senate, and that those committees had the power to require that the safety devices be installed on automobiles, and that that would be the appropriate way to go about it.

In other words, they stress very heavily the jurisdictional aspect. But we did not give up easily on the question. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut was the first major amendment that the conferees considered. We debated it for awhile and found ourselves in disagreement. We then passed over it. When we had decided on virtually everything else in the bill, we came back to that amendment. We disagreed again and we disagreed again. The Senate conferees—both the minority members of the conference who were representing the Republican side of the aisle and the Democratic members—were unanimous on every vote. We voted on the issue several times before we finally suggested a compromise, which the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] had suggested to the Senator from Louisiana. He thought that it might be a possible compromise. We tried to get that. We could not get it. Eventually we found ourselves with no choice. We would either have had a deadlocked conference or we would have to yield on that amendment.

The Senator has a good amendment. His cause is completely correct. So far as I am concerned, I say to the Senator, "Bring your amendment up again and we will vote for it again, because it is right."

Mr. RIBICOFF. Committees in the House have had this measure before them for over 6 years and they have done nothing.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Connecticut is not to be blamed for that.

Mr. RIBICOFF. But I point out that nothing has been done on a subject so vital that it affects the lives of all of us. In the next decade 1 out of every 5 Americans will be killed or maimed in automobile accidents.

So far as precedent is concerned, I point out that there is a clear parallel to the safe-car amendment in section 4854 of the Internal Revenue Code, which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to promulgate cotton standards and cotton futures in order to be exempt from the excise tax and, amongst other things, set the standard of cotton to be delivered; and that standard must conform to the Department of Agriculture Standards.

The Ribicoff amendment would do exactly the same thing; we were trying to achieve the same result.

Time and time again conditions have been placed in tax measures.

I should also like to say, in not giving up, that the same argument against the Ribicoff amendment was asserted in the Finance Committee. The Senator who came to my defense in saying that the Finance Committee was a proper place to consider the amendment was the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, who said he thought it was proper to formulate and legislate national policy in a tax bill because there was a question of divided jurisdiction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree completely with the argument of the Senator from Connecticut. His amendment was in order at the time he offered it in the committee. It was supported in the committee. I forget the vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Ten to seven.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It was a comfortable majority. I was proud to be one of those supporting it. As the Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, in the conference the conferees were unanimous up to the very end in support of the amendment. It was only at the last when, around 7 o'clock at night——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We had been there for 4 hours.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We were confronted with a deadline on this important bill. We would then deadlock the conference on that particular point. It was with great reluctance that the Senate conferees yielded. There was no break. While I recall that some of the conferees voted against the amendment in the committee, in the conference, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, all conferees on the part of the Senate were solidly on our side throughout in support of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and also the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

I did not support the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] in the committee, but we did save more of the amendment of the Senator from Illinois in the conference than we did of the Ribicoff amendment. It was one of those things that came out. But we were supporting both those amendments, because when we went to the conference as conferees, we tried to discharge our responsibilities as conferees in support of the position of the Senate.

I have never worked with a conference committee that was more united in supporting the position of the Senate than we were that day. With the exception of these two very important amendments, we came away with most of the amendments that the Senate had adopted. These were the two major amendments. We recognized that.

If the Senator wishes to bring up the question again, I shall be glad to continue my support of his proposal, because I think it is one to which the Senate should direct its attention.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I am very grateful. I do not know of any other Senators whose support I would rather have than that of the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Louisiana. One of the great privileges of being in the U.S. Senate is to serve on the Finance Committee with members, both Democratic and Republican, of that committee. I do not know a more considerate, or more thoughtful committee, where the members respect one another, than the Senate Finance Committee. Not only from what the two Senators have told me but from reports I have received from staff and Members of the House, I know no group of conferees could have fought harder for the amendment than did the two Senators who are now on the floor addressing themselves to the problem. I thank both of them for the fight that they made for the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The Senator from Louisiana has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. HART obtained the floor.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to the comments voiced by the Senator from Connecticut. I thought back to the day before yesterday, the day we acted on the excise tax bill. At that time I rose on the floor of the Senate in opposition to the amendment that was then offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE]. That amendment would have retained 5 of the 10 points of the auto excise tax. I am glad that the Senate rejected the amendment. I argued that it would defeat the basic economic purpose of the bill.

I commend the conferees on their overall success, but I regret that there is retained the 1 point now to be earmarked for general revenue purposes. I share fully the concern of all of us that we have safe automobiles, safe cigarettes, and properly labeled consumer goods. But in my book the tax bill is no place for any of that. Substantive legislation is out of place in this excise tax reduction bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure that the Senator does not take issue with the conferees. It was our purpose to support the position of the Senate in relation to the Senate amendments.

Mr. HART. Indeed, I do not. I hope I have made clear—and I shall make clear again—that I am voicing my own position and reasons behind it. The Committee on Commerce is now considering one of the standards of safety about which I understand the General Services Administration will make its own conclusion. That relates to the question of standards for safe automobile tires. If anyone thinks that there is an easy answer to that question, he ought

to spend a few hours with us in the committee hearing testimony on that subject. Shift from the problem of standards for tires to standards for entire cars, the problem is enlarged many times.

These are substantive items. I hope that to the extent that Federal safety legislation is in order and desirable, it will go onto the books in a hurry. But this is a revenue measure and the record made in the consideration of it by the Senate and the House committees with respect to safety was rather sketchy. My impression is that there was no testimony.

Lastly, I suggest that the action of the House ought not to be concluded to be the result of the Detroit lobby which, incidentally, does not make the tiger that goes into the tank. The action in eliminating the auto excise tax, for the reasons I described in my speech against the Lausche amendment, was proper and sound.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We in Louisiana make quite a bit of the tiger that goes into the tanks. The price of a gallon of gasoline at the plant gate today is the same as it was in 1926. But that gallon has three times the power it had in 1926. It is one of the few products as to which the increased price is the result only of the increased Federal tax. The automation and efficiency of the petroleum industry have given the consumer three times as good a product, three times as efficient a product for the same price he was paying in 1926, almost 40 years ago.

Since the Senator from Michigan raised the question about a tiger in the tank, I thought he would want to know that the tiger is not costing a bit more; in fact, it would cost less if it were not for the high taxes imposed by the State and Federal Governments on the product.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. HART. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. You ask whether these devices have been tried and tested. I have before me the GSA standards for safety devices on automobiles purchased by the Federal Government. These standards will go into effect on June 30, on all automobiles purchased by the Federal Government. That covers about 60,000 cars. These regulations and standards were developed in conjunction with the automobile industry. So it is not a question of dealing with something ephemeral. We are dealing with some items that already are optional equipment for present-day autos.

Congress had a great opportunity to require the installation in all automobiles, as standard equipment, the safety standards that the General Services Administration has worked out with the automobile industry, and which they say are essential. So it is not a question of talking about standards about which we do not know anything. We are talking about standards that have been tested.

There was a great opportunity to make cars safer since we were going beyond the tax cut the President had advocated. Suddenly there was an opportunity to utilize 4 points of the auto excise tax for safety and 1 point, as suggested by the distinguished Senator from Illinois, to take care of the great problem of wrecked and abandoned cars. We could use the extra 5 points over what the President has suggested to do something useful.

Since these problems are generated by automobiles, what better way to help solve them than to take the extra 5 points and do something for the American people?

Mr. HART. I cannot agree that what Congress is about to do is to give the automobile industry nine-tenths. It gives it to the consumer of this country. I am no less anxious than any other Senator to make certain that automobiles are made safe. I do not know whether tires were included.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Tires were included.

Mr. HART. Why is it that we are spending time in the Committee on Commerce trying to resolve that very tough question? There is a jurisdictional question, just as clear as crystal. To suggest that those who opposed the Ribicoff amendment were reacting to the Detroit lobby is perhaps unfair. I believe it is prudent to suggest that perhaps the problem is not so simple as the Senator from Connecticut suggests and that a substantive question is involved. Perhaps the record of the Committee on Finance on safety standards is not so complete as it might be. I think that merely their self interest would suggest that the American automobile manufacturers are as much concerned about safety as is anyone else.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have great respect for the Senator from Michigan. I understand that Michigan is the State where most automobiles are made. It is said that the automobile industry should be concerned about safety. I say there is no more selfish industry in America than the automobile industry when it comes to safety. They have been callous; they have been indifferent. I have been living with this problem for 10 years, trying to make the automobile industry think of safety. The industry installed seat belts in cars only when they were forced to; they installed exhaust devices only when they were forced to; they installed safety devices only when Congress and State governments got tough. On a voluntary basis, the automobile industry will not install safety features. That is the great problem.

When the distinguished Senator from Michigan speaks about prudence, what could be more prudent than protecting the lives of the people of the country?

On the front page of almost every newspaper there is a story of tragedy resulting from automobile accidents. Day in and day out, people are being slaughtered on the highways at the rate of 48,000 a year. More people have been killed on the highways than have been killed in all the wars that the United States has fought since its inception. Four hundred times more people have been killed on our highways in the last 4 years than in military personnel lost in Vietnam in that time. Basically what we are trying to do is to save lives.

Congress votes billions of dollars for research to improve the Nation's health. Billions of dollars have been spent for research at NIH.

But can the Senator from Michigan imagine billions being spent to prevent the killing of 48,000 people by automobiles? This is something that Congress should be concerned about. It is one of our great national tragedies. We had a great opportunity to do something about the condition, and one of the tragedies of the bill is that we have not done it.

We are shocked by airplane crashes. We just finished a long discussion about the Federal Aviation Administration. When an airplane crashes, immediately the aviation authorities go to the scene of the crash. They reconstruct the plane. They look for every screw and bolt in an effort to determine what caused the crash. When a jet plane crashes, immediately it is headline news across the world. Yet it would take 500 jetplane crashes a year to equal the number of people killed annually in automobile accidents.

It is to the discredit of the automobile industry that it was not fighting for this amendment, when it had an opportunity to do something in a time of great need. The monkey is on the back of the Detroit automobile industry, and it will stay there until it installs safety features in the automobiles in which we ride.

Mr. HART. Nothing that the Senator from Michigan said suggested that it was imprudent to seek to develop safe cars. I explicitly said that prudence could be described as characterizing those who supported the Ribicoff amendment. I said that it would be unfair to suggest that imprudence attached to those who felt that safety standards was substantive legislation, and that there is not a record made on which to act. I am suggesting that neither side should assume that divine guidance has turned up here tonight to tell us whether this tax method was, in the long run, the best way to achieve the objectives all of us seek—safe cars. I believe the auto excise tax should be removed; I believe this tax bill as now before us would be even better if the last tenth had been removed. But removal of the nine-tenths is a great and progressive contribution to the economic strength, not just of Detroit but of the Nation's. Let us proceed to legislate safety in orderly fashion, not by amendment to a tax bill.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the route we take in this bill to curb the disastrous carnage on our highways is not new or unique. White phosphorous matches under present law are taxed more heavily than safety matches. Indeed, this very bill will remove the tax from safety matches altogether, and leave untouched the tax on unsafe phosphorous matches.

As the Supreme Court said in *United States* v. *Sanchez*, 340 U.S. 42 (1950):

> It is beyond serious question that a tax does not cease to be valid merely because it

regulates, discourages or even definitely deters the activities taxed * * * The principle applies even though the revenue obtained is obviously negligible * * * or the revenue purpose of the tax may be secondary.

Mr. President, Congress has been holding hearings since 1959 on this subject. The standards promulgated by the GSA are established in accordance with Public Law 88–515, of August 30, 1964. We were seeking to achieve the same standards that the GSA are authorized to place into effect for the automobiles bought by the Federal Government.

If it is a matter of prudent public policy that a Federal employee must drive a safe car, it is my contention that every American is entitled to drive a safe car.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I believe that the Senator from Louisiana ceded the floor. I know that the hour is late. However, there are a few questions that I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut. The first is a substantive question.

Can the Senator from Connecticut inform us about the amounts of money which the automobile industry spends on safety research and safety promotion so far as cars are concerned, and the amounts of money which they spend on advertising?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have a communication from the National Safety Council dated March 16, 1965. This communication indicates that $11 million is spent annually by the motor vehicle industry and other private agencies on safety research. In 1963 the auto makers spent $247,898,216 on advertising, or $34.60 a car. This is the difference that is involved—$34 per car for advertising, and a few pennies for safety research. This amounts to 22 times more for advertising than for safety. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the letter referred to.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SAFETY COUNCIL,
Chicago, Ill., March 16, 1965.

GOV. HOWARD PYLE,
Chairman, Advisory Council to the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, Washington, D.C.

DEAR GOVERNOR PYLE: In response to your letter of January 27, our research report committee, which you appointed to assist in planning for preparation of the report the President's Committee will make to the President, met in Washington, D.C., on February 18 and 19. It was our understanding that the responsibility of this Committee was "to recommend a complete plan leading to a finished report in as short a time as possible," in response to the President's request to "report back to me as to the current status of traffic safety research (in medicine, law, engineering, psychology, public information, etc.) and what should be done to stimulate broader activity."

In gross figures the committee is aware that the amount spent by public agencies on traffic safety research will aggregate about $5.5 million this year. Another $11 million is spent annually by the motor vehicle industry and other private agencies on safety research. This is less than two-tenths of 1 percent of the $13 billion spent in 1964 by all levels of government on highway and street construction and maintenance, and a miniscule fraction of approximately $100 billion spent on highway transportation last year out of a total gross national product of $525 billion.

In view of these facts and because any well-considered plan for stepping up this effort requires first a knowledge of the current state of traffic safety research, the Committee recommends that an in-depth study o. the current status and potential of traffic safety research be undertaken by an appropriate body such as the National Academy of Sciences. With the counsel of a liaison group under the aegis of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety, the intent of the study would be to develop a comprehensive framework for future traffic safety research.

The Committee further recommends that upon completion of the in-depth study on current status, a series of research workshop conferences be held to evolve within the framework provided in the report, a needed program of accident-prevention research.

The Committee wishes to draw attention to the enclosures. Enclosures A and B indicate a suggested approach for an in-depth study and followup activities. Enclosures C and D refer to the possibility for immediate action based on generally recognized needs.

The present Committee has welcomed this opportunity to assist in responding to the President's request. The source and timing of the request dictate bold, far-reaching proposals which could make 1965 a landmark year. Traffic safety research is an essential element of an effective action program directed toward increasing the saftey, convenience, and economy of the transportation of persons and goods on our highways and streets.

Respectfully submitted.

MURRAY BLUMENTHAL., Ph. D.,
Chairman.

J. AL. HEAD,
PAUL V. JOLIET, M.D.,
D. GRANT MICKLE,
ROSS A. MCFARLAND, Ph. D.,
S. A. ABERCROMBIE,
Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Do we not have several years before the tax on automobiles will be reduced below 3 percent?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes. I believe that we have until January 1, 1968.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Would this not give Congress the time in which to consider means of retaining more than the 1-percent tax for the purpose of getting rid of the junk yards? Would this period of time not enable us to pass legislation for auto safety such as the Senate just passed in the excise tax bill?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not believe there is any question about that. We have about 3 years to place it in effect.

In all due respect to the distinguished Committees on Commerce—and they are distinguished, both in the House and in the Senate—they could pass substantive legislation and make provision, in conjunction with the Committee on Finance, to retain at least 2 years of the 4 percent to be used for this purpose.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Connecticut implies that although he may be beaten this year, he will return to the fray.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have been beaten before, and I have come back to the fray. I am not going to quit on an issue that is as important as this is. This is a fight that we will continue. I appreciate the help and support of the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

My prediction is that, through public opinion and by congressional action, the automobile manufacturers will realize that they have a duty to the people of the country to put these safety features in automobiles.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut no doubt recalls the old Scottish folk song of the Scotchman who was beaten in battle and said: "I will lie me down and bleed awhile and rise and fight again."

The Senator is going to bleed for a while, and then rise and fight again.

Mr. RIBICOFF. We shall start fighting again on July 13, 1965.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, does the Senator have any further remarks to make about the demise of the safe car amendment?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not have any further remarks to make.

I yield the floor. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his interest.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief, because I know the hour is late.

In regard to the question of committee jurisdiction and whether it is appropriate to have a social purpose attached to tax legislation, apparently Congress thought it was proper to encourage gambling, because the tax was taken off the sweepstakes. Congress thought it was proper to encourage chewing tobacco, because the tax was taken off chewing tobacco. Congress thought that it was proper to encourage the playing of cards, because the tax was taken off playing cards.

I do not quarrel with the removal of these taxes. However, I do believe that the argument is being made that it is proper to encourage the consumption and use of these articles, but that it is not proper to discourage death on the highways, and that it is not proper to try to dispose of wornout automobiles. There seems to me to be a fundamental inconsistency in these attitudes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hope that the Senator will be charitable to those of us who represented the Senate. It was our obligation to persuade the House to take every amendment, including the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire and the amendment of the Senator from Illinois.

We did our best to try to prevail on all of them.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana fought like a tiger to retain those amendments. It was a very welcome change from the practice which was followed on occasion in past years when, as the Senator from Louisiana once said, Senate provisions would be given up before the rotunda was crossed by the conferees.

The Senator from Louisiana has introduced many admirable reforms. One reform which he has stanchly supported is to fight for the amendments agreed to by the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana conducted the leadership of the bill, on both the floor and in the committee, with great courage and integrity.

However, now I am responding to the question of whether it would be proper to use the taxing power to encourage

safety or to remove the wornout bodies of automobiles from the public lands.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe that one of my most frustrating moments was when I made the statement, which is subject to challenge, that as far as my amendment to a particular measure was concerned, the conferees threw it in the trash can before they ever reached the House side of the Capitol.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct. I was reminding the Senator of the criticisms of conference actions in the past. We think those are the gone and forgotten days now that the Senator from Louisiana is the No. 2 man on the committee and sits with the Sanhedrin on the joint committee and the conferees, consisting of the three leading Democrats and the two leading Republicans whose gracious presence we see on the other side of the aisle.

There is another story on the question of committee jurisdiction that I should like to touch on now.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the compliments that the Senator has paid the conferees. I concur in the statements made regarding the leader of the conference.

We supported the amendment. We regret that we could not do better than we did. I remind the Senator that the senior Senator from Kansas had an amendment that was refused, also. I thought it was a very meritorious amendment. By this amendment we tried to get a little refund for a man who had lost his gasoline but had paid the Federal gas tax on it. They refused the amendment. I lost the amendment, even with the able assistance and leadership of the Senator from Louisiana and others.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I did not mean to imply, either by direct statement or inference, that the conferees favored their own position.

I blame the House for this matter, not the conferees. This is the only way which we have to talk to the House, through the medium of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

What I am trying to say is that the argument of the House, which I am sorry to say was raised again by my good friend from Michigan—that social aims have no place in taxation—is, I think, completely wrong.

It so happens that the bill which I introduced for the disposal of automobiles and the withholding of a portion of the excise tax to finance the disposal was presented to the Senate, and the eminent Parliamentarian referred it to the Committee on Finance. He thought it appropriate to send to the Committee on Finance. Now there are some Members of the House who pretend to know more about Senate practice and procedure than the Senate Parliamentarian. I say if it was good enough and appropriate enough to be referred by the Parliamentarian to the Committee on Finance, it is an appropriate subject to be included in the tax bill.

I deeply regret that my dear friend from Michigan feels to the contrary, but I am not criticizing him; I am criticizing the House.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, while the Senator is criticizing, I hope he is not criticizing the majority whip of the House, the Representative from the Second District of Louisiana, because BOGGS, of Louisiana, was the single House conferee who was for the Senator's amendment and also for the Ribicoff amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I understand. I merely say a majority of the House conferees apparently took this position.

I congratulate the people of Louisiana not only for having so eminent a Senator as the majority whip, but also for having the eminent House majority whip. I am sure those whips will never raise their voices against the virtuous but always against the malefactors and in the public interest, and that any chastisements due will be accorded solely to those who deserve them.

As an alternative to my amendment I suggest to the automobile industry, and to the House, that perhaps we should enact a law that would require that the ownership of junked or obsolete automobiles should revert to the automobile manufacturers who produced the cars, and that the manufacturers should be charged with the responsibility of disposing of these junked cars, so that those who gave birth to the cars should be responsible for their ultimate disposition, burial, cremation, disassembly, or transmigration into other automobiles.

Also, I ask my distinguished friend, chairman of the Senate conferees, if it would not be possible, at a later time, for a portion or all of the revenues which will be retained by the 1-percent tax to be expended, upon passage by Congress of appropriate legislation, for the disposal of these cars, and also for such safety or health measures as the Congress may determine are connected with the automobile.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope very much that this will be done, so we shall be able to preserve safety, health, and to remove eyesores which are created by the auto industry.

I take heart from the suggestion of the Senator from Louisiana. I thank him again for the energy and fidelity with which he has discharged his onerous duties.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to precede the conference report vote for the excise tax reductions with a brief statement.

I am of the opinion the reduction will have a stimulative effect upon the economy, and contribute greatly to the continued propserity of our Nation.

The fact that the 1966 budget will not be affected by the entire cut is noteworthy. As I understand it, only some $1.8 billion of the cut will be applicable to the fiscal year 1966 budget.

And the fact that tax structures will be greatly simplified, through the excise tax eliminations, is, I believe, one of the most important features of this bill.

I have long supported excise tax reductions. Generally, these taxes, as we know, were instituted during World War II and the Korean war, to discourage the purchase of some items, and of course to raise necessary war revenues.

Certainly, there is no longer the need to discourage automobile sales, purchase of radios and televisions, handbags, and so forth.

The need for revenue remains, but as I have noted, the increased consumer purchasing power will spur production a great deal, which in turn will generate additional revenue in other areas.

Several amendments that I felt would have been beneficial to our citizenry were defeated. The commuter amendment, of which I was a cosponsor, granting tax deductions for those who travel to and from work, would have been most helpful to the taxpayer.

Mr. President, I feel that this wise excise tax cut should be followed by administration efforts to reduce expenditures. As we have seen, such expenditures are climbing higher each year, particularly with new administration programs now under way.

I caution once more against planned deficit spending. Federal Government expenditures and programs must and should be held in line if our economy is to expand and remain healthy and strong.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the excise tax bill, which has been agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives conferees. For some time I have supported the repeal of these taxes, which, for the most part, were initially levied as emergency revenue-raising measures at the time of the Korean war, World War II, or the depression of the 1930's.

I have opposed the continuation of these oppressive taxes because many of the excise taxes were adopted without any program or systematic basis. Consequently, these excise taxes are discriminatory in their application.

During the last Congress many of us tried to have these excise taxes reduced or eliminated. Unfortunately, the administration at that time was not sympathetic to this attempt and our efforts were narrowly defeated.

Now that the administration has agreed with our position: to wit, that these discriminatory and oppressing taxes should be reduced and repealed, the American people will receive some relief from their heavy tax burden.

Excise taxes, unlike income taxes, impose burdens on those whose income is below the level of their personal exemptions and deductions. The excise taxes that will be reduced include the taxes on telephones, jewelry, luggage, handbags, automobile parts and accessories, toilet preparations, cosmetics, radios, and most of the household appliances.

The reduction will simplify the tax system by greatly reducing the number of separate taxes, as well as the accompanying burden or business of collecting and reporting on those taxes. It will cut the Government's cost of tax collecting and enforcement.

I commend the Senate leaders and Finance Committee members for the way in which this matter has been handled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware moved to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION FOR CLERK OF THE HOUSE TO MAKE A CORRECTION IN THE ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 8371

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 442 from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 442, which will be read by the clerk.

The legislative clerk read the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 442) as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Clerk of the House of Representatives, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 8371) to reduce excise taxes, and for other purposes, is authorized and directed to strike out "gasoline" in the new section 6424(b)(2) added by section 202(b) of the bill and to insert in lieu thereof "lubricating oil".

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution, which corrects a technical error in the conference report on H.R. 8371.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FIRMS ACQUIRING PRIVATE PATENT RIGHTS ON PUBLIC NASA RESEARCH SHOULD PAY FAIR MARKET VALUE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, let me say to my good friend from Louisiana that that was the longest 5 minutes I have ever endured. Almost 2 hours ago my friend, who is the poorest timekeeper I have ever known, but who is one of the most charming men I have ever met, said, "If you would let me have 5 minutes on the conference report before you introduce the bill, I would appreciate it." I said, "I am delighted."

I merely want to say I would do it again, even if I knew it would take so long a time as it did, because it was an educational debate. I learned a great deal, and I am greatly indebted to the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Illinois, and the Senator from Connecticut for enlightening me during the debate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am deeply grateful for the Senator's kind remarks, and by way of apology——

Mr. MORSE. It is not necessary to apologize.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I want to tell him I will give him the best support I can on the measure he is about to introduce.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator and I have always agreed in measures of this kind. I think there will also be support from the Senator sitting on the left of the Senator from Louisiana, but I turn now to discuss the bill.

Mr. President, I introduce today a bill which has two objectives: The first is to reestablish congresional control over the disposition of patent rights by the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, and the second is to provide that private companies desiring to acquire interests in such patents and processes repay the taxpayers of this country fair market value pursuant to the so-called Morse formula.

I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and that the text of the bill be printed following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 2160) to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the disposition of proprietary rights in inventions made thereunder, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since my first term in the Senate, when the Nation was concerned with the disposal of World War II military surplus, I have advocated that legislation proposing to dispose of real and personal property which belongs to the United States—and, therefore, to the taxpayers—contain a requirement for the payment of fair compensation to the Government. Where this property is acquired by private companies for commercial exploitation, the Morse formula provides that full fair appraised market value be realized by the Government. If a State, municipality, or other Government authority wishes to buy the property for devotion to purely public uses, the formula provides for payment of 50 percent of fair market value. A Library of Congress tabulation in 1962 estimates that real estate of an area two-thirds the size of the State of Rhode Island has been made subject to the formula.

This formula is presently incorporated in the statutes of general applicability governing the disposal of U.S. real estate and personal property, such as the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 484). In addition, the Morse formula applies to specific property transfer bills in the Congress.

This bill would extend to the field of intangible personal property, such as patents and processes arising out of NASA-financed research, the principles long applied to the more ancient and traditional forms of real and personal property interests.

In the course of my remarks, I will review the basic documents which apply to the administration of patent properties by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and will explain how the regulations which the agency chose to adopt in September of 1964 are contrary to the U.S. Constitution; the statute creating the space agency; the subsequent legislative history of this statute; the clear line of congressional intention as expressed in related legislation and by the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Patents; and also what NASA's own chief legal officers told the Congress and the public on several occasions was "the only conscientious way of administering the (Space) Act.

It is these marked departures from the law of the land which obliges the Congress now to rewrite the applicable section of the Space Act of 1958, in order that the enormously significant economic issues be resolved in the public interest. and that those acting contrary to the public interest be dealt with according to specific provisions of the law.

The ultimate issue before Congress is the ownership of the fruits of publicly financed research of a magnitude that mankind has never seen before. The Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] recently placed in the RECORD a tabulation of Federal research and development expenditures indicating that the sum of taxpayers' dollars expended by the United States for these activities since the end of World War II is approximately $85 billion (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Mar. 9, 1965, p. 4536).

As the Members of this body are aware, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is probably the fastest growing research activity in the world. In 1961, NASA spent $744 million on R. & D., or 8 percent of the Federal Government's R. & D. budget. In 1964, the agency spent $4.3 billion, which constitutes 30 percent of all Government research, according to the Report of the House Select Committee on Government Research (H. Rept. 1940, 88th Cong., 2d sess.).

Today's research and development contracts result in the creation of products and processes of vast commercial value. Ready examples are the technology of Comsat's Early Bird communications satellite, which is a successor to NASA's Syncom satellites; and the Boeing 707 transport, which was engineered and developed initially as the Air Force's KC–135 jet tanker.

Government funds account for about 89 percent of all R. & D. in aircraft and missiles, 67 percent in the electronic and communications industry, 57 percent in

the scientific instruments field and significant percentages in machinery, rubber, and other lines of commerce.

This I have been heard to say so many times over the years, that we do not have a free-market economy. Too much of our economy is defense oriented. I should like to see America return increasingly to a free-market economy.

I point out again tonight that most businessmen in this country are subsidized, directly or indirectly, by defense and other Federal expenditures.

Just how worth while such a Government contract can be is illustrated by a Comptroller General's report—B–133042 of May 19, 1960—cited by Representative Holified on the floor of the House of Representatives on January 28, 1963. This report cataloged that a ballistic missile contract awarded by the Defense Department provided a company "with the opportunity to obtain many patents in an area of great potential significance," including 11 sufficiently basic and important enough to provide the basis for entirely new product lines. The company also acquired 69 patents of secondary importance from this same contract.

If it were pointed out to some of the business moguls and magnates in this country that they live off Government subsidies, they would be offended. Of course, that would weaken the argument which they like to apply to others concerning creeping socialism.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield at this point?

Mr. MORSE. Yes, I only wish to say that so many of the big businessmen of this country really—according to their own definitions—have become Socialists judging from the sources of their money from the state. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon knows that businessmen love to come to Washington, love still more to catch us at home, and tell us that we should run the Government the way they run their businesses. If the Senator from Oregon was a lawyer or I was a lawyer for a corporation, and we had a research contract that would pay someone a guaranteed profit to do research, and the man that they paid to do it would be guaranteed not only a profit, but also would be permitted to have complete monopoly rights on what he found after he did the research, reserving to himself the use of the service for the corporate purposes and not to sell it to the public, then those corporations would be running down to the Attorney General's Office and demanding that we be indicted, on the theory that no lawyer could be so stupid, that he had to be a thief.

As an illustration of what Government patent policy means, think of it as if the Government were paying someone $200 million to build a bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, and then, having built the bridge with the taxpayers' money, with a profit of $14 million guaranteed, to proceed to say that the Government only would have the right to drive its own vehicles across that bridge, and that the taxpayers, having paid for all of it, would have to pay whatever toll the contractor wished for the next 17 years—that the contractor in addition to his $14 million guaranteed profit would, in fact, own the bridge.

Mr. MORSE. That is the attitude of certain business exploiters. They call that economic freedom. It is economic freedom to exploit the taxpayer.

The present NASA patent program, should be labeled "the taxpayer-shaking-down program."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe I am correct in this, and I trust that I shall not be violating a confidence, because the person involved I am sure would have no objection to my saying it, but a member of the Rockefeller family paid me a visit today. He told me that when he had more time, he would like to explain more about the workings of philanthropy, because the Rockefeller Foundation does a great deal of that, and this gentleman was concerned with it.

I asked him, "Do you people do much health research with Rockefeller funds?"

He replied, "Not nearly so much as we used to, because the Government is doing so much of it now we thought that we would put our money to better use elsewhere."

I said, "When you did your research, did you let the folks you paid have private patents on it, or did you require that the benefits of their research be made freely available to the public?"

He replied, "I do not recall precisely, and I will check it, but I feel confident that you will find wherever we spent philanthropic money, we always insisted that the public receive the benefit of it. We would not wish to spend philanthropic money merely to put someone in a position in which the public interest would be his captive. If philanthropic money is to be used, we feel that all the people of this country should benefit from it."

Would it not be fine if the Government of the United States took that same attitude, utilizing the public's money so that all the people would have the benefits of research?

Mr. MORSE. The purpose of introducing my bill is to help the cause to which the Senator from Louisiana has referred. I believe that once the American people become aware of the extent to which they are being shaken down by an avaricious group of American business forces who seem to feel that whatever they can get by with is all right. The American people will have a few messages at the voting booths at election time to send to politicians who do not vote to stop this shakedown.

In this connection, my speech tonight is aimed at political education. If we can only get the voters educated enough to start beating Members of Congress who go along with this kind of shakedown, we shall be doing something practical about bringing about the reforms necessary to protect the taxpayers.

I am frank about it. This is an issue that, ultimately, only the voters can settle. We can introduce legislation, but until the people say to the politicians, "You pass the necessary legislation or get ready to stay at home," I believe that the influence of the business exploiters will continue to be so great on Congress that we shall have continued difficulty in correcting this situation.

All I can say to the American people is, "The kind of legislation you get is up to you. You can have any kind of legislation you wish, if you will only perform your responsibilities as citizen-statesmen." The trouble is, too many people do not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator from Oregon know that a great deal of the research being done on Government contracts is research that the company would have done anyway for its own purposes?

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When we look at something like health research, if we think about the spending of billions of dollars of public money to enable someone to find a better answer to a disease, we are benefiting the public. If it were research that the pharmaceutical companies would have done anyway, and if all we did was to turn around and force them to take hundreds and perhaps billions of dollars of Federal money, which they would have spent out of their own pocket anyway in their research programs, and if we did the same thing with aircraft manufacturers, is it not fair to say that the $15 billion for research and development would turn out to be a bigger steal than the worst item in the foreign aid program?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. However, we would have to go pretty far to find a bigger steal than the foreign aid bill.

I spent 2 hours this afternoon with an American busineessman, who briefed me on his experiences in Bolivia. He told me of the shocking corruption that exists in connection with American foreign aid in Bolivia.

This is only another phrase of the same problem that I am talking about so far as the obligation of the American voter is concerned. We will get this shocking business stopped when the American people familiarize themselves with the facts. When they do, they will demand some remedial action from Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows that when Franklin D. Roosevelt was President and when Harry Truman was President, they used great courage in resisting the pressures of the bankers and the Wall Street interests with regard to interest rates. They kept the level of the interest rates on Government obligations at around 2 percent.

Starting with President Eisenhower, that policy was reversed. Some people like to say that it started with the so-called accord under President Truman, but he still kept tight control, even though in the Korean war he was maneuvered into a corner where he had to let the interest rate go higher than he wanted it to go.

The Senator knows that since the time when George Humphrey was Secretary of the Treasury and Mr. Burges Under Secretary, the interest rates on the na-

tional debt have doubled. We like to talk about how the national debt which was, back at that time, 130 percent of the gross national product, in 1946. Now the national debt is 47 percent of the gross national product. However, the cost of carrying that great national debt is just as great when measured against the gross national product, because the executive branch, particularly the Federal Reserve Board, has permitted the interest rate to double. If the interest rate goes up 2 points on the national debt, then the interest rate on everything else has to go up by an equal amount.

Mr. MORSE. Of course.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. So on the public and private debt of a trillion, two hundred and fifty billion dollars, that amounts to $25 billion more that the borrowers have to pay to the lenders. Generally speaking, the borrowers tend to be poor. If they are not poor if they are corporations, they include the cost of the interest in the price of the product, and pass it on to the customer, who is usually poor, compared with the corporations.

In addition, while there are certain wheels within wheels, I believe it can be said, generally speaking, that in the last analysis interest tends to be a tax on the poor, for the benefit of the rich.

Many people contend that the only way one can lose on research is by doing it on a small scale, because while one might not find what he is looking for, he might come across something that is 10 times as valuable as what he was looking for. For example, a researcher in Germany was trying to find a better dye for dying cotton material. He came across some item that had a certain reaction on bacteria. It occurred to him that it might work in medicine. The result was sulfanilamide. That was a great breakthrough on which all the other sulfa drugs were based. It was probably the greatest breakthrough in the field of internal medicine that had occurred in 100 years, and perhaps the greatest that had occurred in the previous thousand years.

What was discovered there was much more fantastic than what that man was looking for in the first instance.

The argument is that one cannot lose money on research as long as it is done on a big scale.

Conceivably what we could find with this $15 billion research investment might be worth the $15 billion that we are spending.

If we read President Johnson's book, "My Hope for America," we see that he spells out the magnitude of research and that generally it tends to mean that we are doubling our technical know-how every 9 years with the expenditures that we make.

To permit all of that to be in the private domain of a few Government favorites, who do not bid on the contracts, but fight for them and compete for them, and to permit all that to be in the private domain of a few big companies, when added to the $20 billion, plus, that the people are paying out in interest rates because of the policies of the Federal Reserve Board, which presumably this administration, like the previous one, is not quarreling with, works out to be about $35 billion a year that the average man would just be outraged about if he understood what was going on. That is more than one-third of the whole cost of Government.

Mr. MORSE. The position the Senator from Louisiana has taken on this and related problems, in which I have joined him in support for years, is unanswerable. I am very glad to have his contributions to this presentation.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the research and development funds expended by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration are generally even more valuable commercially than Pentagon contracts.

The Defense Department specializes in researching and developing weaponry. In the Space Act of 1958, however, Congress makes clear in the preamble that the Space Agency should direct and conduct its aeronautical and space activities solely for peaceful purposes and for the benefit of mankind (42 U.S.C. 2451).

Mr. Gayle Parker of NASA's General Counsel's Office, told a convention of the Federal Bar Association in Philadelphia on September 24, 1963, that:

> In direct contrast with the Defense Department, the patent portfolio of NASA contains not only patents for inventions of its employees, but also a high percentage of inventions made by its contractors. Thus, the NASA patent portfolio is expected to include a significant number of patents for inventions which have commercial applications (Federal Bar News, vol. 10, No. 11, November 1963).

The New York Times of September 28, 1964, stated that, during the past 6 years, there have been 2,240 inventions of this kind made by contractors pursuant to NASA contracts. These technical advances are literally of incalculable value. As a matter of fact, the present administrative regulations of the Space Agency make it impossible for the Congress or the public ever to ascertain the extent or value of this property.

For a start, it is certainly the obligation of Congress to make sure that its committees and the public have the means to know the value of this property which is created out of taxpayers' money. One consequence of my bill would be to make possible an inventory by making fair market values of patents a matter of public record.

The next question to arise is how this treasure trove of property should be administered? Should disposition take place in public and be a matter of record, or should it be contracted away in private by a host of anonymous contracting officers as is permitted by the present regulations? Who should receive the benefits of these inventions and the profits from their commercial exploitation? Should the taxpayer who put up the money be considered? Should the universities and hospitals have a share? What of States and municipal governments which must provide services to our people? Should small businesses be considered? Or should most of this wealth and potential wealth become the property of fewer and fewer corporations of larger and larger size?

Fortunately, the Constitution and the Congress have provided some guidance in these matters.

Article IV, section 3, of the Constitution reposes the responsibility for disposition of U.S. property directly upon the Congress. It provides:

> The Congress shall have the power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.

Section 8 of article I also vests in the Congress the specific responsibility for "promoting the progress of science and useful arts," which is the basis upon which Congress established the patent system.

Also pursuant to these mandates, Congress enacted section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958. This section provides that the rights of the taxpayer who paid for the NASA research and development underlying a patent cannot be waived unless the specific patent was the subject of a hearing before an Inventions and Contributions Board.

The obvious rationale of this requirement is to insure that an administrator would be aware of any invention of great potential value before disposing of all the commercial interests.

It is important to emphasize that the principal intent of the bill which I am introducing is a restoration of the original intention of section 305, as enacted by the Congress and subsequently nullified by NASA's 1964 regulations.

The intention of the Congress to exercise positive control of patent property in behalf of the U.S. Government had, at the time of the Space Act, been expressed in a long and unbroken line of congressional enactments stretching back to 1946, including the Housing Act of 1946, the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, the Atomic Energy Acts, as well as the Space Act, the Coal Research Act, the Water Resources Act, the Saline Water Act, the Solar Energy Act, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Disarmament Act, the Housing Act of 1958, and the Agricultural Marketing and Research Act. Recently, the Appalachia and water pollution legislation of the 89th Congress followed this pattern.

Incidentally, the amendments on the Appalachia water pollution legislation were amendments successfully offered by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

As the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights [Mr. MCCLELLAN] said on April 23d of this year:

> In recent years the Congress has frequently considered the inclusion of patent provisions in legislation authorizing new Government research programs. It is clearly the intent of Congress that the basic guidelines of Government patent policy should be determined by the Congress.

As more fully set forth in the Memorandum of Law which follows, the current NASA regulations of September 1964, are constructed upon an assumption of wholesale waiver of patent rights belonging to the United States, and these regulations do not provide for ascertainment of the value of patent property and positive control over its disposition in

the public interest. On the contrary, the regulations permit a contracting away, or what some call a giveaway, of rights to any and all inventions at the time the contract is signed.

Under these regulations, the disposal of patent property takes place before anyone knows how many patents will emerge, or what their potential value may be, and before they could be brought before the board created by the act. To assert that this system protects the interests of the United States in publicly developed intangible property is to talk patent nonsense.

Likewise, upon occasion, these giveaway regulations have been defended by citing the Presidential Memorandum and Statement of Patent Policy of October 10, 1963. It is curious legal doctrine that a memorandum by the President should take precedence over an act of Congress. However, let us dig a little deeper and examine this memorandum and statement.

After stating that inventions in scientific and technological fields constitute a valuable natural resource, the policy statement begins as follows:

> The following policy is established for all Government agencies * * * subject to specific statutes governing the disposition of patent rights of certain Government agencies.

To interpret this language as allowing a departure from the precise requirements of the Space Act in order to give away significant and valuable natural resources raises further questions of considerable interest.

I am at a loss to understand why the President of the United States has let NASA get by with it. In my judgment what NASA has done is in open defiance of the so-called Presidential memorandum which, interestingly enough, the Administration cites as an authority. It just does not follow. But, of course, if the President lets them get by with it, they will continue to do it.

I do not like to say it, but I never hesitate to say it. I think our President is following a wrong course. Our President could have stopped a great deal of this giveaway if he had instructed the head of NASA in his own language and his own Presidential memorandum. I read the relevant section again:

> The following policies are established for all Government agencies—subject to specific statutes governing the disposition of patent rights of certain Government agencies.

The Members of this body are well aware that the Space Administration tried on more than one occasion to amend section 305 of the Space Act in order to allow the waiving away of U.S. rights in patent property in the manner embodied in the present regulations. Congress consistently refused to allow the agency to do so.

So, during 1964, we find that the Administrator, without the consent of Congress, adopted regulations which have placed him in a position directly opposed to and in defiance of all these authorities, including the Presidential patent memorandum of October 10, 1963, upon which he purports to rely. It is also pertinent, if somewhat embarrassing, to recount that the regulations are contrary to what NASA's own legal officer told the Space Committee of the House of Representatives on August 19, 1959, was "the only conscientious way of administering the act." NASA's general counsel repeated the substance of this statement on several occasions—before Congress, professional associations, and the public. Some of his language is collected in the accompanying memorandum of law.

Senators know what the bureaucrats count on. They have to take the witness stand and testify before a committee. They say those things that they think will carry out their aims and objectives. They know—and they count on this—that Congress will get so busy with other things hereafter that they will never get back to check up on their testimony. They will never do an adequate job of "watchdogging" on the regulations that they subsequently put out in direct contradistinction of their testimony. They also count upon the tendency of human beings, even Members of Congress, to forget. I have seen those things happen so many times in my years in the Senate that I have grown a little "gun shy" about administration witnesses.

On the Foreign Relations Committee we see time and time again the discrepancy between the testimony of witnesses from the State Department, starting with the Secretary of State, on down through the other witnesses that the Department sends to the Congress.

The same thing applies to the Pentagon, starting with the testimony of the Secretary of Defense. If we should check back on that testimony a few months later and compare it with the policies which are inconsistent with their own testimony that the departments have followed, we would see that they have learned that after they appear before us Congress will soon forget what they said, fail to check up on what they said, or be unaware of inconsistent administrative regulations, if they exist. The sad result is that, in many instances, Congress in practice has become a great abdicator—an abdicator of its responsibilities to the people of this country, of protecting its legislative rights, functions, duties, and passing more and more power down to the executive branch of the Government, with the result that the American people are losing their freedoms and are often oblivious to it. Tonight the American people are not nearly as free as they were 10 years ago. Tonight they are not nearly as free as they were 20 years ago. The Congress must assume a large share of the responsibility for it because Congress increasingly abdicates one congressional function and duty after another and passes the buck to the White House and the bureaucrats who serve the White House.

More and more, I think we are becoming a government of presidential supremacy.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Along that line, the Senator from Louisiana recalls an incident that occurred when he first came here. The Senate was confronted with a bill which was sponsored by the steel companies, the cement companies, and various other industries. It was known as the basingpoint pricing bill.

Mr. MORSE. I remember it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a bill to legalize certain practices that had been declared by the Supreme Court to be in violation of the antitrust laws.

The Senator from Oregon may recall that those who advocated the bill paraded here with a letter from someone in the Bureau of the Budget, saying that the bill was in accord with the policies of the President. It was said that Harry Truman was for the bill.

The junior Senator from Louisiana went to the White House to talk with President Truman about the bill. The President was not very communicative. The most he said was that he thought he understood the problem as well as any Member of the Senate, because he had once served on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and had sat through some hearings and had studied the subject when he was a member of the committee. In the Senate we fought the bill up hill and down dale for about 2 years. Finally the supporters of the bill—the steel companies and various other large concerns, including cement companies—succeeded in pushing the bill through Congress.

When the bill reached the White House, what did President Truman do? He vetoed it. But Congress had received a letter from some minor functionary in the Bureau of the Budget, who led us to believe that that was a measure that President Truman wanted us to pass.

Mr. MORSE. That happens frequently. I again wish to give deserved praise to the Senator from Louisiana, for the many times in our service in the Senate when he stood up in opposition to delegating legislative responsibility to the executive branch of the Government. That practice involves the patent evil that has developed within NASA, because what the Director of NASA is getting by with in his issuance of regulations has the support of the legislative branch of the Government. I do not know why Congress should permit it.

I am at a loss to understand why the President permits it. We ought to check the President. That is why I am introducing a bill to exercise the constitutional check which the Congress possesses by law as to the President and the Director of NASA.

I am proud of the recent Gemini space flight. I rejoiced, with all the rest of my colleagues in the Senate, when Astronauts McDivitt and White received their medals at the White House today. It was a humbling experience to be in their presence in the Chamber today. I said to each of them, when I shook hands with him, that I felt I was a better person because of the great contribution each of them had made to the history of our country. I believe it was a source of great pride and also a cause of deep humility on the part of each Member of the Senate.

I am looking forward to the Apollo project and further American successes in space. I realize that our peaceful

rivalry with other nations provides powerful temptations for the Space Agency to take certain shortcuts.

Because of these forces, perhaps this day of Washington's tribute to the Gemini 4 astronauts is the most appropriate time for the Senate to receive the bill I am introducing tonight.

As the London Economist magazine stated this week, in its issue of June 12, 1965, at page 1279:

> There may be times when the American moonracers may wish that they did not have to perform in the democratic way, in public, all faults on view.

But there are other national values which are equally important—respect for the law, the open character of our economic system, and the quality of our morality. To accept the philosophy of the Space Agency that the achievement of our national goals justify the use of means such as have been adopted, would be corrosive of some of the most basic and precious values of our society.

The conscientiousness with which Congress deals with the conflict of these values will profoundly affect the character of our economic system, and the prospects of its small business segment.

The Justice Department, in February 1962, confirmed that companies selected to perform research and development work obtain substantial competitive advantages—acquisition of facilities and training of staffs—even without the acquisition of patent rights. The Justice Department report states:

> The effect of giving such firms additional patent rights as well tends to consolidate their already dominant positions and make their preferred status in new and important industries even more immune to competition than it is now.

Against the background, the opinion was expressed in Fortune magazine—February 1965, page 150—that there are some 29 companies which are qualified to compete on missile contracts in the United States, some 15 that can build airframes, and only 8 which can compete for contracts to build helicopters. We should also bear in mind that little more than 10 percent of NASA's research budget goes to small business, while the great bulk of these funds are concentrated in the hands of our greatest industrial corporations.

Our treatment of these issues, and the control over the disposition of these large amounts of seedbed money appropriated annually to the Space Administration for research, development, and exploration in this decade will surely influence the size, number, and relative influence of our Nation's businesses for decades to come. It will affect the atmosphere of economic freedom and competition in this country and personalities that will be molded by it.

Just as surely, the disposition of the legal issues involved will affect the quality of our Government and the attitude that our citizens and business corporations adopt toward it.

In summary, Congress is faced with marked departures from the law of the land, the specific requirements of the Space Act of 1958, and prudent public policy.

In addition, Congress is faced with a solemn duty and responsibility for a great deal of extremely valuable property belonging to the United States and for patent and other systems for its disposition and development.

The Constitution has given the responsibility to Congress, and we cannot wish it away, delegate it away, or study it away. The Administrator of the Space Agency has raised these issues directly, and they must eventually be met.

Mr. President, I do not contend that this bill is the final word on the subject. I envision that the Government departments and agencies, as well as business groups concerned, will be able to suggest improvements and refinements on the basis of their experience and expertness. Such comment and criticism will be welcomed. However, the bill does represent a systematic approach to these issues and a vehicle for their consideration. I believe that such consideration is in order, and I urge that the Senate proceed with it.

I am raising for the consideration of the Senate one of the most serious giveaway programs that confront the American taxpayers, to the detriment of those taxpayers. I am raising here, in regard to intangible personal property, as patents are, the same warning I raised in 1946 when I first came forward on the floor of the Senate with what has become known as the Morse formula, which regulates the disposal of tangible Government surplus property.

It has not been easy in these many years to stand up against attempts on the part of some of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate to avoid the effects of the Morse formula. They have been successful a few times by moving the consideration of a bill that I had blocked on the unanimous-consent calendar because it violated the Morse formula. But to the everlasting credit of the overwhelming majority of my colleagues in the Senate and of the leadership of the Senate during those years, they have stood with me as I have persistently, or in the views of some, stubbornly, insisted that there be no exceptions to the Morse formula.

The last accounting that I received would indicate that since 1946 this persistence or stubbornness—depending on whichever word one may wish to adopt—has saved the American taxpayers over $800 million.

Mr. President, the application of the Morse formula to intangible personal property such as patents—as I seek to have applied by the passage of this bill—would save the American taxpayers not hundreds of millions of dollars, but many billions of dollars decade by decade.

I start a fight on the floor of the Senate to obtain passage of my bill. I well know that this might take a long time.

I hope this will not take as long as it usually takes to pass a piece of legislation which is so critically needed in order to protect the welfare of all the people of our country. However, irrespective of how long it takes, so long as it is my trust to serve the great people of Oregon in the Senate, I intend to press for legislation that will bring the giveaway program of NASA to an end.

I hope that, in due course of time, the President of the United States will see the soundness of the position of the senior Senator from Oregon and will himself issue a new Presidential memorandum on patents, notifying his Director of NASA that he does not want the current regulations to be continued because of the economic harm they are doing to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, what the Senator is saying reminds me of a story which the late Henry Fountain Ashurst, a former Senator from Arizona, once told me. He said that he was constantly receiving pressure from President Roosevelt to report the Court-packing bill from the Judiciary Committee, of which he was chairman. It seemed that, for a long time, the President would call him every morning and ask when he was going to report the bill.

The Senator recalls that that bill was vigorously opposed by Burton Wheeler, Gerald Nye, Alben Barkley, George Norris, and other Senators of that caliber.

Since there was so much pressure and so much clamor against the bill in the press, as well as in Congress, Senator Ashurst was reluctant to report the bill.

He told what he said to the President:

> Mr. President, your case is getting stronger all the time.

He told us the story that, when he was a prosecuting attorney in Arizona, a fellow had stolen a lot of butter from a warehouse. The sheriff had apprehended him with the butter. Every time that Ashurst moved to prosecute the case, the defense counsel came in and asked for a continuance. Ashurst said that he invariably granted the continuance, saying, "It is all right with me to continue the case. The longer the case is delayed, the stronger my evidence will be." [Laughter.]

I state to the Senator that this giveaway of private patents on almost $15 billion of Government research is such an outrage that the longer it takes us to win the case, the stronger our case will be with the people. The people are beginning to understand this issue.

Many people have never heard about it. When they do hear about it, they cannot believe their ears.

I was explaining this to a large industrialist a few nights ago. He could not believe it. He could not believe that the Government would do this. His concern spends large amounts of money in research.

The first inquiry was, "Why is the Government in the research business, anyway?" In many instances, we are only forcing this money upon people to do research that they would do on their own account if we did not force them to do it. I explained that in some instances the Government had an interest in getting information quicker than it would otherwise, by means of spending a lot of money.

When we reached the second point, he could not believe that the Government would give this money away on a guaranteed-profit basis by means of which the fellow awarded the research contract could keep it for himself without the people who paid for it, the taxpayers, being privileged to use it. It was something that he could not conceive of.

Mr. MORSE. That is the attitude of most impartial taxpayers. If we could get the issue before the taxpayers as jurors, if we could take this case before any jury of 12 impartial jurors, we would get a unanimous decision against the Government policy. I do not believe that there is any question about the merits of our position.

It is a sad thing that we can have the kind of economic power used by selfish interests in this country, which succeeds in permitting this wrong to be committed against the taxpayer.

The Senator very well knows that in 1954 I stood on the other side of the aisle then, as an Independent, when President Eisenhower got his leadership in the Senate to offer one of the most inexcusable giveaways and shakedowns of the American taxpayer that has been proposed in my many years in the Senate. That was a proposal of the Eisenhower administration to give away—without a cent of cost to the utilities of this country—the entire atomic energy program for the development of which the American taxpayers had paid more than $14 billion during the war.

As I recall, the bill was 110 pages long. There were not 10 or 11 Senators who ever read the bill. The bill got through the House early that day, in a debate that did not last more than 1½ hours. The measure was steamrollered through the House.

The bill was brought to the Senate about 2:30 in the afternoon. The Republican majority leader asked for a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill that day. I objected. The Senator will recall that that did not make the majority leader very happy with me.

He stayed within the rules, but he went as far as the rules would permit him to go in giving me a verbal tongue lashing. I found it rather amusing.

The RECORD will show that he said, "I want to say to the Senator from Oregon that he can either give me this agreement or start talking." I suggested to him, and it will be found in the RECORD, that he ought to reflect on what he was really proposing. I told him that he was, in effect, really proposing that we ought to repeal the unanimous-consent rule of the Senate.

I said to the Senator from California:

Just reflect upon that suggestion for a moment. I think that the Senator will agree with me as to how many votes he would get as far as the proposal is concerned.

There were then 96 Senators. I said:

You won't get 95. If you think a little longer, you will not get your own. It will dawn on the Senator that although it is WAYNE MORSE today, it might be Bill Knowland tomorrow.

I did not persuade him. He made it perfectly clear to me that I would either give him that unanimous consent agreement or I could start talking. I obliged him—I started talking.

The Senator from Louisiana knows the end of the story. We talked for 13 days and 6 long nights. We adopted amendment after amendment, including a patent amendment.

We put on that filibuster fight, which is what it was called, although it was really 13 days and 6 long nights of political education for the American people, because we had not been talking very many days before our colleagues started hearing from home. We did that, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, because we knew we had to focus attention on the floor of the U.S. Senate until the American people realized the shocking political steal the Eisenhower administration was trying to get away with.

We added a patent amendment. We added an amendment that made it possible for the nuclear pilot plant at Hanford, Wash. We added amendment after amendment.

I am battle scarred from the kind of battle I am starting tonight. But let me say I am ready to repeat the fight, because whereas we had over $14 billion involved in the atomic energy fight, we have involved here a giveaway that may well add up to $14 billion a year in the decades ahead. It is the same kind of fight that the Senator from Louisiana and I, Estes Kefauver, PAUL DOUGLAS, and a small number of other Senators fought not so long ago when we tried to stop the giveaway of the space communications system.

We did not have enough Senators to support us long enough in that fight, as the Senator knows. But is it not interesting to pick up the newspapers these days and read about what our alleged allies in Europe are doing in connection with the space communications satellite system? I think it was yesterday that I read that Great Britain was slapping a tax on it. Compare that with all the assurance we received that if Congress would give it away and let a selfish, monopolistic, government-created corporation set up by this Government take over the people's property rights in a satellite space communications system, that all the dire predictions the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Oregon, and the rest of us made never would come to pass. We do not hear much from those colleagues about the matter these days.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator hear the other day that the television networks are complaining that the space communications system is victimizing them with respect to using it. They are complaining to the extent that they want their own satellites in order to relay their television programs. They are complaining about the monopolistic conditions created by the satellite communications system.

Does the Senator recall that when we were debating that measure that advertisements appeared in the newspapers, sponsored by the television networks, inferring that it was a fine bill?

Mr. MORSE. The inference was that those of us who were opposing it were "creeping Socialists" because we were trying to protect the property rights of the American people. How one could be a Socialist and protect the property rights of the American people was beyond me then, and is now. We are encountering the same sort of propaganda that will be used against my bill.

Get ready for the kind of fallacious non sequitur testimony from the NASA people that we got from the Secretary of Defense and his uniformed lackeys who tried to pave the way for the satellite communications giveaway.

We were told they were going to have their own defense satellite system. Does the Senator remember? We were trying to point out that, after all, we were trying to protect the Government's interest, but we were told they were going to have their own system. The Senator knows that did not happen.

The American taxpayers have been shaken down again, because within the defense budget is a huge sum of money in order to have this monopolistic corporation that was set up by a majority of the Congress to work for the Defense Department.

Yet I understand there are some rumblings of discontent and dissatisfaction with that in the Pentagon. Eventually we may be able to do something to rectify the great mistake that was made in giving away the wealth of the American people to this Government-sponsored corporation, with the profits going to the corporation set up by the Government.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not seen the statement, but someone drew my attention to it. I shall look into it. I am told that the International Telephone & Telegraph Co., a large international company operating in 50 nations, which has assets of $10 billion, or probably more, and which is one of the largest stockholders in Comsat, is complaining about the monopolistic condition under which that corporation is operating.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Louisiana and the rest of us warned about that during the historic debate. It would be interesting to have some Ph. D. candidate take the record of that debate and then take the record of the discussions that are now going on in connection with the space communications satellite system and write an analysis of what has already transpired on the question of bearing out what those of us who were opposing the bill forewarned was going to become history under that giveaway program.

I am trying to get my President, from the standpoint of his historical record, saved from the type of record that is going to be written about him if he does not join us in checking the excesses of NASA.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon is rendering a great service in making this speech and in introducing the bill.

The Senator from Oregon used an analogy between his effort to save the public domain from giveaway legislation, in which he has been the most diligent Member of this body, and the saving of the public interest in research and de-

velopment paid for by public funds. I wonder if the Senator realized this? Admiral Rickover tells us that every 9 years we are doubling the know-how we have with our research and development effort, and President Johnson, in his book "My Hope for America," says as much.

The Federal Government owns about 25 percent of the land surface of the United States. The Senator from Oregon has fought to stop the Government from giving that land to somebody without a fair price for it, in the interest of the taxpayers and the public. He has been successful, because of his diligence, in that area. Comparing that effort with the doubling of the knowledge we get in a 9-year period, it means 50 percent of that knowledge was discovered by research and development efforts.

Now with 70 percent of that being paid for by the taxpayers my figures would tell me that in effect 35 percent of our knowledge, after 9 years of research, properly belongs in the public domain, that it properly belongs in the public domain for every small businessman to use to compete with the mighty corporation, or for anyone else to use in competition or in the public interest, or even to provide a philanthropic service to others. All of that 35 percent of the total sum of knowledge of industrial know-how under the patent policy is to be locked up for a handful of big corporations. Ninety-five percent of it would be locked up for the benefit of less than 100 corporations.

Mr. MORSE. I not only thank the Senator from Louisiana, but I wish to say that the statement he has just made is a better statement of the objectives of my bill than anything I could say about it. In those few sentences, the Senator has really described the essence of my bill. It is that objective which I seek to carry out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Did the Senator have occasion to look at the statement I made concerning Miles Laboratories and the PKU test?

Mr. MORSE. No.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. This is what happened. A doctor named Guthrie in New York, a dedicated man, was given a grant for $500,000 to do research on the mental retardation of children. He was given another grant of approximately $250,000, and he discovered a way to treat a disease whose name is mouth-filling but is called by the initials PKU.

This disease results from a vitamin deficiency, and if not immediately detected within 30 days after a child is born, the child could be hopelessly retarded for life, but if discovered in time, correct diet will repair that deficiency, and the child will be a healthy child.

I am told that PKU is one of the worst forms of mental retardation.

Dr. Guthrie developed a kit to use to draw a few drops of blood from a child's heel, to see whether the child had this feared disease. He could manufacture the kit for approximately $6.

A lawyer friend suggested to him that he should take out a patent on the kit before someone else could get a patent on it and thereby deny the public the benefit of the research. They, therefore, obtained a patent. So far as the doctor was concerned, that was the end of it. However, Miles Laboratories wanted to distribute the kit, and the doctor licensed them to distribute it; and he signed the appropriate form.

There was a labor shortage at Miles Laboratories, so the doctor assigned his royalties to a foundation for the benefit of mentally retarded children, because he did not wish to make any profit out of it. He wished only to benefit mankind.

But, since Miles Laboratories had this labor shortage, the doctor proceeded to produce the kit, using his retarded children who were his patients, at a cost of $6, a price which the doctor thought was fair and which he thought Miles Laboratories would charge.

What does the Senator from Oregon think Miles Laboratories charged for this kit?

They placed it in a cardboard box and charged $262 to all the hospitals which wanted it. In Louisiana and Massachusetts the hospitals were making the kit themselves. The figure of $6 was just about what it cost. Miles Laboratories went to court to sue. The hospitals in Louisiana and Massachusetts were urged to cease producing these kits for their own use.

In the meantime, our people inquired if the Government had paid for this research, and if so, why could not the people of this country have the benefit of it? The word got back to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and some honest worker there pulled out the record which disclosed that Dr. Guthrie had done this research under assignment and the patent rights belonged to the United States.

Thank the merciful Lord that we were in a position to protect the public's interest, which required the patent to be signed over to the Government and we went ahead with producing the little kits.

I have not seen the Miles Laboratories rejoinder, but when I explained the situation on the floor of the Senate, Miles Laboratories issued a statement saying that obviously I did not have all the facts. However, I had many more facts than Miles Laboratories wished known. Dr. Guthrie, who had invented the kit and did all the fine work for mankind, issued a statement saying that Miles Laboratories should be barred by law forever from having any patent rights for doing something like that. He was outraged, shocked, and stunned to think that his development and all his efforts would have been so distorted, because what he had done was in the interest of the public, but now the public's money was to be used against the public interest.

The same people are in Washington lobbying away, trying to get themselves on the same bill with the space contractors, the airplane contractors, this contractor, that contractor, so that the whole bunch of pirates—lovable buccaneers that many of them are—can come in here to obtain the enactment of a law to give it all away. Of course they will phrase it in some sweet language which says the Administrator can waive the rights, if he finds it to be in the national interest. The agency and department heads will go to work and give it all away, saying, "We have 5,000 patent applications, and we only gave away 50."

Of the 4,950 they saved we would find that they were not worth the paper it would take to write the patents on, and the 50 they would give away would be for something like penicillin, sulfa drugs, or a drug which might save the life of a cancer victim. It is like saying, "I am letting you buy this drug for $5 a pill," when of course the price should really be 2 cents a pill. But, "Look what a great benefactor I am to mankind. I am selling this pill cheaply. If I wished to be mean I could make you pay $10."

Yet the public has paid for the pill in the first place.

I can recall the time when I was asked to aid in the fight on heart disease in my hometown of Baton Rouge. I put on a Santa Claus costume about Christmas time. I stood out on the street and shook a tin cup asking people to give their money to help fight heart disease.

Imagine the outrage I would feel if I were to find out that having gotten out there on the street in that Santa Claus costume, all the money went to some pirate instead of for the public interest, because he was the first one to find the idea with the public's money.

That is what we are doing when we sit here in this Chamber claiming that we are public benefactors, that we wish to justify the $30,000 a year salary voted us and giving the public's money away on this kind of scheme.

Mr. MORSE. I cannot begin to tell the Senator from Louisiana how much I appreciate his bringing these facts out in the RECORD tonight, and how completely I agree with him.

Of course, the Senator knows that he, will be regarded as a dangerous man in certain quarters for saying these things.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It will not get me any extra campaign contributions, the Senator can be assured of that. Perhaps for some one else, but not for me. But let me say to the Senator from Oregon that since I mentioned this incident of heart disease, if Senators continue to vote for this kind of giveaway, some of us should get together and buy them some Santa Claus costumes and send them to them.

Mr. MORSE. If only we could continue making the record which the Senator from Louisiana is making tonight. There is another answer. Once the people come to understand that they are not willing to support the people who wish to make a profit out of the suffering of their fellow Americans, or wish to make a profit out of denying to fellow Americans their legitimate rights—which is all I am seeking to do in this bill, to prevent them from stealing the rights of the American people—I say that once the American voters come to understand that, I have confidence in the voters that they will give these politicians their answer at the voting booth. There is no other way to do it.

If the politicians do not wish to live up to their responsibilities in Congress, eventually the voters must beat them. That is the only language they understand.

Let me say to the voters of America that it happens to be their responsibility. I only wish that the voters would be as willing to follow the obligations of citizen-statesmanship which they have every right to expect us to follow in the Senate.

After all, unless they are willing to do it, I am afraid that we shall continue to see a majority in both Houses of Congress voting to continue support, on issues like this, not the people, but the exploiters of the people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator will yield further, I believe the Senator knows of the great pressure that has been brought to bear on a great many of the large newspapers in the country. I suspect that has been done through their advertisers. The pressure is to try to keep the newspapers from carrying articles discussing this issue, on the theory that public discussion cannot help but benefit the side that the Senator is advocating.

I believe it would be only fair to commend the Washington Post for its very fine and courageous attitude that that newspaper has taken on the subject.

I should like to ask unanimous consent, if the Senator does not object, that at the conclusion of his remarks there may be printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, June 13, entitled "Which Way on Patents?"

The editorial discusses the bill that I have introduced, as well as the one that was introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and also the one that was introduced by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN]. I believe the Senator from Oregon will find that his bill is very similar, follows the same general philosophy as the bill of the Senator from Louisiana. I believe he will find that the editorial supports his position.

Mr. MORSE. Yes; I have read the editorial. I commend the Washington Post on the editorial, and am happy to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That newspaper has taken a courageous position on this subject. If many other newspapers were to explain this subject to the people, it would become a very important political issue.

Mr. MORSE. I agree with the Senator.

The bill (S. 2160) to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the disposition of proprietary rights in inventions made thereunder, and for other purposes, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2457) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 305. (a) Whenever any invention is made in the performance of any scientific or technological research, development, or exploration activity under this Act every invention made as a result of such activity shall be the exclusive property of the United States, and if such invention is patentable a patent therefor shall be issued to the United States upon application made by the Administrator, unless the Administrator waives all or any part of the rights of the United States to such invention in conformity with the provisions of subsection (f) of this section and in compliance with the requirements of this section.

"(b)1 Each contract and lease entered into by or on behalf of any officer or agency of the United States with any party, and each grant made by any such officer or agency to any party, under authority conferred by this Act shall be entered into or made under conditions effective to insure that such party will furnish promptly to the Administrator a written report containing a full and complete description of, and full and complete technical information concerning, each invention, discovery, improvement, and innovation which may be made as a result of any activity undertaken or performed under that contract, lease, or grant.

"(b)2 If any such party fails to transmit any such report to the Administrator within thirty days after the date on which any such invention, discovery, improvement, or innovation is made, such party shall be liable to the United States for the payment of a civil penalty in the amount of $100 for each additional day of delay in the transmission of such report to the Administrator. Action for the recovery of any such penalty shall be instituted by or under the direction of the Attorney General, and may be instituted in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which the defendant resides, is found, or transacts business. Process of such court in any such action may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States marshal thereof.

"(c) No patent may be issued to any applicant other than the Administrator for any invention which appears to the Commissioner of Patents to have significant utility in the conduct of aeronautical and space activities unless the applicant files with the Commissioner, with the application or within thirty days after request therefor by the Commissioner, a written statement executed under oath setting forth the full facts concerning the circumstances under which such invention was made and stating the relationship (if any) of such invention to the performance of any work under any contract, lease, or grant entered into or made under this Act. Copies of each such statement and the application to which it relates shall be transmitted forthwith by the Commissioner to the Administrator.

"(d) Upon any application as to which any such statement has been transmitted to the Administrator, the Commissioner may, if the invention is patentable, issue a patent to the applicant unless the Administrator, within ninety days after receipt of such application and statement, requests that such patent be issued to him on behalf of the United States. If, within such time, the Administrator files such a request with the Commissioner, the Commissioner shall transmit notice thereof to the applicant, and shall issue such patent to the Administrator unless the applicant within thirty days after receipt of such notice requests a hearing before a Board of Patent Interferences on the question whether the Administrator is entitled under this section to receive such patent. The Board may hear and determine, in accordance with rules and procedures established for interference cases, the question so presented, and its determination shall be subject to appeal by the applicant or by the Administrator to the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in accordance with procedures governing appeals from decisions of the Board of Patent Interferences in other proceedings.

"(e) Whenever any patent has been issued to any applicant in conformity with subsection (d), and the Administrator thereafter has reason to believe that the statement filed by the applicant in connection therewith contained any false representation or omission of any material fact, the Administrator within five years after the date of issuance of such patent may file with the Commissioner a request for the transfer to the Administrator of title to such patent on the records of the Commissioner. Notice of any such request shall be transmitted by the Commissioner to the owner of record of such patent, and title to such patent shall be so transferred to the Administrator unless within thirty days after receipt of such notice such owner of record requests a hearing before a Board of Patent Interferences on the question whether any such false representation was contained in such statement. Such question shall be heard and determined, and determination thereof shall be subject to review, in the manner prescribed by subsection (d) for questions arising thereunder. No request made by the Administrator under this subsection for the transfer of title to any patent, and no prosecution for the violation of any criminal statute, shall be barred by any failure of the Administrator to make a request under subsection (d) for the issuance of such patent to him, or by any notice previously given by the Administrator stating that he had no objection to the issuance of such patent to the applicant therefor.

"(f)(1) Whenever any person has made any invention which under subsection (a) is the exclusive property of the United States, such person may make written application for the transfer to such person of all or any part of the interest of the United States in that invention under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe in conformity with the provisions of this section. Each such application shall contain a full and complete (A) description of the invention as to which the application is made, (B) statement of the circumstances under which that invention was made, (C) statement of the relationship, if any, of such invention to any contract, lease, grant, or program of the United States or any department or agency thereof, and (D) statement of such other information as the Administrator shall determine to be necessary for a determination of action to be taken upon such application. Each application for the transfer of any property interest of the United States shall be accompanied by a sealed bid specifying the sum which the applicant offers to pay to the United States in compensation for such interest if transfer thereof is granted.

"(2) Each application made under paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be transmitted to an Inventions and Contributions Board (referred to hereinafter in this section as 'the Board') which shall be established by the Administrator within the Administration. Upon receipt thereof, the Board shall accord to the applicant opportunity for hearing thereon. Notice of hearing upon each such application shall be published by the Administrator in a publication of general national circulation at least once not less than ninety days before the date of such hearing, and a second time at least sixty days after the first such publication but not less than thirty days before the date of such hearing. Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, any person shall be entitled to intervene as a party to such proceedings application. Each such hearing shall be sub-

ject to the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(3) Upon the basis of evidence received in such proceedings the Board shall transmit to the Administrator its written report thereon. If the Administrator determines, upon the basis of the report made by the Board upon any such application, that considerations of equity clearly favor the granting of such application and that the public interest would be served thereby, he may transfer to the applicant the whole or any part of the interests of the United States in the invention as to which such application was made. Any such transfer shall be made upon the payment of an amount equal to the fair market value of the interest transferred as of the time of the transfer, and upon such other terms and under such other conditions as the Administrator shall determine to be required for the protection of the interests of the United States. In no case shall such fair market value be less than the amount of the applicant's sealed bid. Each such transfer made with respect to any invention shall be subject to the reservation by the Administrator of an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferrable, royalty-free license for the practice of such invention throughout the world by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement with the United States.

"(4) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe, any person who intervenes, in any proceeding under this subsection with respect to any patented or patentable invention, in opposition to the transfer for which application was made under paragraph (1) may in such proceeding offer evidence to the effect that the Administrator in the public interest should grant to him authorization for the use of such invention, and may file with the Administrator at the time of his intervention an application for the purchase of one or more specified interests in that invention subject to the conditions prescribed by this paragraph. Each such application made under this paragraph shall be accompanied by a sealed bid containing an offer to purchase such interest or interests in the invention for a sum or sums specified therein. If the application made under paragraph (1) with respect to that invention is denied, the Administrator shall determine whether it is in the public interest to grant one or more of the applications made by intervenors under this paragraph for the purchase of interests in the invention. If he determines that it is in the public interest to grant any such interest, he shall consider the bids made therefor by intervenors, and shall grant such interest to the intervenor who is the highest responsible bidder for such interest. Any such grant shall be conditioned upon the reservation by the Administrator of an irrevocable, nonexclusive, nontransferable, royalty-free license for the practice of the invention throughout the world by or on behalf of the United States or any foreign government pursuant to any treaty or agreement of the United States. If, after the denial of an application made with respect to any invention under paragraph (1), the Administrator determines that it is not in the public interest to grant any interest under this paragraph, he shall return unopened all sealed bids made by intervenors.

"(5) Each determination made by the Administrator in or with respect to any proceeding under this subsection shall be made in writing, and shall be accompanied by a report in which the Administrator shall set forth fully the facts and circumstances upon which reliance was placed in the making of that determination. Within 60 days after the final determination of any such proceeding by the Administrator, any party to such proceeding who is aggrieved by any determination made therein by the Administrator may institute action in the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia for the review of such determination. Upon service of the complaint in any such action upon the Administrator, he shall certify to the court a true and correct copy of the transcript of all evidence taken in such proceeding and a true and correct copy of each determination and report made therein by the Administrator or by the Board. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine any such action, and to enter therein such orders as it may deem proper to affirm, modify, set aside, or enforce as affirmed or modified any determination made by the Administrator in such proceeding. In any such action, findings of fact made by the Administrator shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. Upon application made by any party to any such action, the court in its discretion may order additional evidence to be taken before the court or before the Administrator upon such terms and conditions as the court may deem proper. Process of the district court in any action instituted under this paragraph may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States Marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

"(g) To the extent to which disposition of rights to any invention has not been made under subsection (f), the Administrator shall determine, and promulgate regulations specifying, the terms and conditions upon which nonexclusive licenses will be granted by the Administration for the practice by any person (other than an agency of the United States) of any invention for which the Administrator holds a patent on behalf of the United States.

"(h) The Administrator is authorized to take all suitable and necessary steps to protect any invention or discovery to which he has title, and to require that contractors or persons who retain title to inventions or discoveries under this section protect the inventions or discoveries to which the Administration has or may acquire a license of use.

"(i) Whenever any person has appropriated to his own use or benefit any invention which under subsection (a) is the exclusive property of the United States, without authority therefor conferred upon him pursuant to subsection (f) or subsection (g), the Attorney General, upon his own motion or upon request made by the Administrator, may institute action against such person in the district court of the United States for any judical district in which such person resides or is found. Such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine such action. If the court determines that any such unlawful appropriation has occurred, it shall enter such judgment, orders, and decrees as it shall determine to be required to provide for the establishment of title to such invention in the United States and for the recovery by the United States of a sum equal to the aggregate amount of all income derived by the defendant through the exploitation of such invention. Any private citizen of the United States having knowlidge of any such unlawful appropriation of any such invention by any person may on behalf of the United States institute action against such person in any such district court for any relief which would be available to the United States under this subsection in an action instituted hereunder by the Attorney General. A successful plaintiff in any such action instituted by a private citizen shall be entitled to recover from the defendant, in addition to any relief granted to or on behalf of the United States, a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the expenses actually and necessarily incurred by the plaintiff in the preparation and prosecution of such action, including a reasonable attorney's fee, as determined by the court. If, in any such action instituted by a private citizen, the court renders judgment requiring the payment of any sum to the United States, the plaintiff shall be paid, from the sum so recovered by the United States, an amount equal to 10 per centum of that sum, or the amount of $50,000, whichever amount is smaller. Process of the district court in any action instituted under this subsection may be served in any other judicial district of the United States by the United States Marshal thereof. Whenever it appears to the court in which any such action is pending that other parties should be brought before the court in such action, the court may cause such other parties to be summoned from any judicial district of the United States.

(j) Whoever with knowledge that an invention is the exclusive property of the United States, (1) appropriates or attempts to appropriate such invention to his own use or benefit without authority for such appropriation conferred upon him under subsection (f) or subsection (g), or (2) knowingly conspires with any other person to appropriate any such invention to the use or benefit of any person not lawfully entitled to the use or benefit of such invention, shall be fined not more than $10,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both. Any person who commits any offense under this subsection with willful intent to defraud the United States of its right to such invention or to the exploitation thereof shall be fined not more than $50,000, or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.

"(k) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'person' means any individual, partnership, public or private corporation, association, institution, or other entity;

"(2) the term 'contract' means any actual or proposed contract, agreement, understanding, or other arrangement, and includes any assignment, substitution of parties, or subcontract executed or entered into thereunder; and

"(3) the term 'made,' when used in relation to any invention, means the conception or first actual reduction to practice of such invention."

SEC. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall have no application to any invention made in the performance of any work under any contract entered into by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration before the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF THE BILL

This bill is a recasting of the present section 305 of the Space Act of 1958. (42 U.S.C. 2457) It is written as a complete section, rather than a series of amendments, for ease in understanding and so that the proposed provisions may be read and considered in context.

This bill extends the so-called Morse formula to disposals of NASA-developed inventions. The Morse formula provides that Federal real and personal property may be acquired for public use by State, municipal, and other governmental authorities for 50 percent of fair appraised market value. Transfer of Federal property for private or nonpublic use must be based upon payment of 100 percent of appraised fair market value.

While not excluding public, nonprofit, and governmental and charitable institutions,

this bill emphasizes ownership and development by free enterprise in disposing of NASA-developed inventions, and stresses that commercial development and exploitation shall be the province of private industry. If particular situations arose where the application of the 50-percent standard seemed appropriate, the Administrator might take it into consideration.

The title of this section: "Property Rights in Inventions—Exclusive of the United States; Issuance of Patent" should be retained, and, I believe, amended by the words "disposition upon payment of fair compensation."

Section 305(a) of the bill shortens and tightens the original subsection which defines the circumstances under which an invention in the performance of activity pursuant to the act shall be the exclusive property of the United States. It does so by substituting the simpler and more comprehensive test of "result of such activity" for the more particular test now in the law.

Section 305(b), on reporting discoveries, repeats the language of section 305(b) of the act, with the exception of the words "contract, lease, or grant" which are substituted for the word "work." This amendment is intended to broaden rather than narrow the section. Section 305(b)2 is based upon two reports of the Comptroller General in November 1964—B-133307 and B-133386—which called attention to the lack of such provisions and recommended financial sanctions when a contractor delayed or failed to submit required information on discoveries and inventions. Language covering this requirement should be included in each agreement between the agency and a contractor.

Sections 305(c), (d), and (e) of the bill repeat the comparable subsections of the present act.

Section 305(f) is the most important subsection of the bill. Under section 305 of the present law, the Administrator is permitted to supplement the statutory standards for waiver by departmental regulations.

The abuses of this grant of authority are set forth in detail in the memorandum of law attached. As a result, it is necessary to substitute clearer congressional guidelines such as those proposed in paragraphs (1)-(5) of subsection 305(f) of this bill. These paragraphs are intended to be executory of article IV of the U.S. Constitution, which makes Congress responsible for the disposition of "property belonging to the United States." They propose to establish in the Space Act the principle that private firms seeking to acquire ownership of patents, processes, and other intangible property developed as a result of the research, development, and exploration activities of the Space Agency pay to the Federal Government the fair market value of these inventions.

Collaterally, the proposed system offers a great deal of flexibility in administering NASA's inventory of valuable patent properties through the grant of exclusive or nonexclusive licenses for any term of years at various rates of royalties thought by the Administrator to be in the public interest.

In order to advise and assist the Administrator in arriving at these determinations, responsible business concerns, Government entities, universities, and other organizations having a "probable public or pecuniary interest" are allowed the status parties to the disposition proceedings. As such, they will have the rights usually associated with this status under Federal law relating to a full and fair hearing, including the rights to notice, to present evidence and argument, and to appeal to a judicial forum if aggrieved by the decision.

The bill contemplates that the regulations in this area will be broad and flexible enough to achieve substantial justice among the parties, and that such regulations should be subject to strict judicial examination against these standards.

Thus, section 305(f)(1) of the bill sets forth the general guidelines for applications for the transfer and disposition of patent property resulting from activities pursuant to the act. It would definitely preclude the granting of advance waivers of Government title to inventions, a practice in which the Administrator has indulged pursuant to the current regulations.

A new feature of section 305(f)(1) is the requirement of a sealed bid by the applicant stating the compensation the applicant is willing to pay for the ownership, excusive license, or other interest in the property.

Since the applicant is presumably the developer of this property, it is in the best position to estimate the worth of the property, its fair market value, and the reasons why the developer should be permitted to acquire a preferred proprietary position.

Paragraph (2) of section 305(f) introduces the rights of persons and institutions other than the developer to enter the proceedings in order that they may seek to establish reasons for their participation in the use or further development of the inventions.

Paragraph (3) of section 305(f) governs the grant to the developer of any interest in the property which the Administrator finds will be in the interests of the United States under all the circumstances. Upon such a finding the bid of the developer is opened and considered. It is further intended that the Administrator may request additional evidence of any kind before making a determination of the value of the interest to be transferred.

In the event of such a transfer, the other parties are protected by the presence of a written record. This record should contain findings on each material point necessary to make determinations as to disposition and value, and shall be available for review.

The requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act apply to these adjudications, and, in addition, it is intended that the regulations and procedures pursuant to section 305(f) be construed to foster an open economic system, substantial justice among the parties, and the public interest.

Paragraph (4) of section 305(f) of the bill permits the Administrator to consider the applications and bids of other parties to the proceeding. It is intended that the Administrator have the utmost flexibility. For instance, he might feel that it would be in the public interest for two or several commercial applicants to be granted rights in the property. He might feel that a single commercial grant plus a public grant would be appropriate. This paragraph imposes no limitations in this regard beyond the standards set forth in this bill and those normally existing in the doctrines of administrative law.

Paragraph (5) of section 305(f) of the bill provides for judicial review by parties aggrieved.

Sections 305(g) and (h) of the bill follow the comparable sections of the act.

Sections 305(i) and (j) of the bill provide financial, civil, and criminal sanctions for those violating the act, and provides mechanisms for the recovery of patent properties conveyed other than in compliance with the act.

Section 305(i) would permit a private citizen to be recompensated for successfully bringing about such a recovery. Section 305(j) would apply to both persons receiving or retaining patent properties unlawfully and those releasing such properties otherwise than in compliance with the act.

Section 305(k) of the bill repeats the language of the present section 305(j) of the act.

Mr. MORSE. I ask unanimous consent that, following the section-by-section description, there be printed a memorandum of law concerning the present NASA patent regulations.

There being no objection, the memorandum of law was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

APRIL 2, 1965.

PROVISIONS OF PRESENT NASA PATENT REGULATIONS WHICH ARE CONTRARY TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ACT OF 1958

In a number of respects the revised patent waiver regulations of September 28, 1964, adopted by NASA are plainly at variance with the requirements of law. Among those respects are the following:

1. Section 1245.104 of the NASA patent waiver regulations (29 F.R. 12273-12274) specifically waives all right of the United States to "all inventions made in the performance of work under a specific contract" if the contracting officer, at the time the contract is entered into, makes specified findings of fact. Presumably such waiver is made in reliance upon general authorization for waiver given to the Administrator by subsection 305(f) of the act. However, that subsection expressly requires that "Each proposal for any waiver shall be referred to an Inventions and Contributions Board" which is required to conduct hearings thereon before action is taken by the Administrator with respect to any proposed waiver. The language of the Space Act, as well as the events surrounding its passage, indicate that this requirement was inserted in the statute to insure that the Administrator would be aware of the existence and nature of any invention as to which waiver may be granted. It is equally obvious that section 1245.104 of the waiver regulations does not fulfill that requirement, and is in direct conflict with the quoted portion of subsection 305(f) of the act.

2. Several of the findings which the contracting officer is required by section 1245.104 of the regulations to make (Nos. (1), (2), (4), and (5)) before a waiver of title by the United States becomes effective as to inventions which may be made under a "specific contract" are formulated upon the premise that title will not be retained by the United States as to any such invention unless it was the "principal purpose" of the contract to make that invention. That premise would automatically deprive the Government of any proprietary interest in an invention which resulted incidentally from activity undertaken in the course of the performance of a contract. Such a result is demonstrably contrary to the provisions of subsection 305(a) of the act. That subsection states in unequivocal language that the United States shall have title whenever any invention is made "in the performance of any work under any contract" which is "related to the contract", unless the Administrator waives in whole or in part the rights of the United States to "such invention" in "conformity with the provisions of subsection (f)". The findings referred to above could be justified only if subsection 305(a) had provided in effect that title should be waived in all cases in which the contract was not entered into primarily for the purpose of making the particular invention which did in fact result therefrom. Such definitely is not the language which the Congress enacted.

3. The remaining findings required by section 1245.104 of the regulations (Nos. (3) and (6)) are based upon the premise that the United States always will waive in favor of a contractor title to any invention made in a field in which the contractor has acquired previous competence. That premise also clearly is unwarranted for the reasons stated in paragraphs 1 and 2, above.

4. Section 1245.105 of the regulations does acknowledge the statutory requirement of

action by the Board, but purports to confer upon the Board power to make advance waivers on a "blind" basis upon the same premises which have been shown by paragraphs 1 and 2, above, to be unauthorized.

5. Section 1245.106 of the regulations applies only after an invention is made, and does require Board action. However, the unlawfully wide scope of the waivers provided by the preceding sections is such that many inventions necessarily will escape scrutiny under section 1245.106. Moreover, the criteria set forth in subsection (b) thereof are formulated in negative terms to specify situations in which waiver will not be granted, thereby implying that waiver will be granted in all other situations. Even the negative limitations upon waiver imposed by subsection (b) are qualified by the provisions of subsection (c). Subsection (c), although formulated in affirmative terms, simply repeats the fallacies of section 1245.104, with the added requirement that the waiver be found to be an added incentive to the contractor to perform the services he has been hired to render.

As shown by the foregoing paragraphs, the patent waiver regulations adopted by NASA do not, in the main, comply with the procedural requirements of the statute. To the extent that they do, their formulation is quite the reverse of that contemplated by the statute. Instead of specifying the situations in which "the interests of the United States will be served" by waiver, those regulations grant waiver in all situations not expressly excepted. Even the situations so excepted are based upon demonstrably unauthorized premises. In short, those regulations must be regarded as an attempt to evade, rather than to comply with, the terms of the applicable law.

That the NASA patent waiver regulations described above represent a willfull attempt at evasion of the provisions of section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 is shown by the interpretation previously given by NASA to those provisions.

In testifying before the Subcommittee on Patents and Scientific Inventions of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives on August 19, 1959, Mr. John A. Johnson, General Counsel of NASA, made the following statement as to the requirement of section 305(a) (hearings on Public Law 85–568, pp. 73–74):

"Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. DADDARIO, I have read into the record section 305(a), which provides that upon the making of these statutory determinations, the title to the patentable invention shall vest in the Government unless the Administrator waives the rights of the Government.

"Under that provision, even though there is another provision in the act that provides for class waivers, we have felt it would be a clear violation of the total spirit of section 305 were the Administrator to make a determination that says, in effect: 'I am going to waive title to all inventions produced by contractors in a particular segment of industry, or in all cases where the Department of Defense is already contracting with a particular contractor on similar research and development work, without knowing in advance precisely what the invention is going to be.' It has seemed to us that the only conscientious way of administering the act is to require that the inventions be reported, that the determinations be made, and that waiver take place afterward. Now, we have in our waiver regulations indicated certain areas where we would deem a prima facie case for waiver to be made out, but even there we have felt we couldn't say with certainty that waiver would be granted, because the spirit of the present law seems to require a conscientious case-by-case determination.

"Therefore, the result of this law, as we have interpreted it, has been to require that our contracting practices with that portion of industry doing business with the Defense Department be essentially different from the Defense Department. It requires that the reporting of the inventions be made, and then an administrative determination be made, followed by a decision to waive or not to waive the invention, whereas under the Department of Defense procedure the contractor could be assured by contract that title to the invention would be retained by the contractor with only a license given to the Government."

* * * * *

Later, in giving testimony on December 9, 1959, before a subcommittee of the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate, Mr. Johnson stated (hearings on the 'Effect of Federal Patent Policies on Competition, Monopoly, Economic Growth, and Small Business," p. 261):

"I think I should say one more thing more about our waiver policy. Contractors have requested that we include in our contract provisions certain assurances that inventions in certain classes will be waived if such inventions are made.

"We have taken the position that the type of contract provision would be inconsistent with the apparent purpose of section 305. It appears to us that we should not grant waivers in advance of the making of the invention because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of determining with any degree of assurance that the interests of the United States would be served by waiver before the precise nature of the invention is known. So we have not included in our contracts any such provisions, and we have informed contractors that this matter is not open to negotiation."

The practice of NASA before the adoption of the revised waiver regulations referred to above was in harmony with the provisions of section 305, as shown by the following extract from an article written by Mr. Johnson in 1961 (21 Federal Bar Journal 37, 47):

"Although the waiver authority of the Administrator extends 'to any invention or class of inventions made or which may be made' in the performance of work under a NASA contract, NASA has adopted the policy of not granting any waivers in advance of the making of the invention because of the great difficulty, if not impossibility, of determining with any degree of assurance that the interests of the United States would be served by waiver before the precise nature of the invention is known.

"Petitions for waiver may be filed by a contractor, an assignee of a contractor, or an inventor who was not under an obligation to assign the invention to the contractor by which he was employed when the invention was made. In every case, the petitioner has the privilege of an oral hearing before the NASA Inventions and Contributions Board, which has the statutory duty of transmitting to the Administartor its findings of fact with respect to each proposal for waiver and its recommendations for action.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, June 3, 1965]

WHICH WAY ON PATENTS?

The dispute over the ownership of patents issued for discoveries made in the course of federally financed research and development work has taken a new and ominous turn. A well-organized lobbying campaign mounted by the drug industry, the electronics industry, and the organized universities has on two occasions defeated Senator RUSSELL B. LONG in his efforts to make those discoveries freely available to the public. Unless the administration adopts a clear-cut position, the patents issued from the work on $15 billion of Federal research contracts may fall into the hands of those who have little interest in utilizing or diffusing new knowledge.

From the time that Eli Whitney got a contract to develop interchangeable parts for rifles in the administration of President George Washington until recent times, the policy on patents arising out of Government-sponsored research was clear. The Federal Government took title to the patents and made them freely available to the public. But that wise principle has been breached, and now lobbyists are busy promoting legislation that would give individual administrators enormous discretion in waiving the Government's patent rights when such action is in "the public interest."

In the debate that centered around the appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and in the committee hearings on the Health, Education and Welfare legislation, Senator LONG's opponents argued that his amendment would cause private industry to withdraw from Federal research and development work. The Long amendment reserves patents for the Government except where "background knowledge" is involved. But not once did any of them adduce evidence to support their contention. The fact of the matter is that few of the industry and university groups which are demanding exclusive titles to patents are in a position to spurn the attractive, cost-plus Government contracts. And those which can proceed with their own research should be encouraged to do so. There is no good reason why the Government must pay for as much as 70 percent of the research and development work that is done in this country.

One of the reasons for defeating or tabling Senator LONG's amendment is that the matter of patents is being investigated by Senator MCCLELLAN's Judiciary Subcommittee. Three bills have been submitted to that body, one each by Senators SALTONSTALL, LONG and MCCLELLAN. The bill submitted by Mr. SALTONSTALL is, to put it bluntly, a vehicle for the wholesale transfer of patent rights to the industries which have worked with public funds. The McClellan bill, which has strong lobby support, is putatively a moderate measure. But it in fact gives individual administrators broad authority to determine when the waiver of Government patent rights is in the public interest, a provision that would surely lead to troublesome discrepancies in the policies pursued by the various Government agencies.

Only Senator LONG's bill protects the public's stake in patents that are financed with tax funds. It deserves the enthusiastic support of the White House which has to date assumed a position of detachment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the formation of the National Committee for Immigration Reform.

This Committee has been in the process of formation since early May. Letters of invitation were sent to a representative group of leaders in the fields of religion, business, labor, education, science, and the professions. The letters, signed by former Under Secretary of State and U.S. Ambassador Robert Murphy, were written in behalf of Walker L. Cisler, chairman of the board of the Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO; and Gen. David Sarnoff,

chairman of Radio Corp. of America. Nathan Strauss III, the New York City civic leader, is chairman of the organizing committee.

Of the some 400 invitations mailed, I am informed that only 4 declinations were received on the basis of opposition to the administration's immigration proposal. The membership of the Committee now totals 250.

The statement of principle, endorsed by all members of the Committee, points out that the national origins provision of our present immigration law is detrimental to our international interests, breeds hatred and hostility toward the United States, blocks comity among nations, and is a hindrance to our Nation's policy of peace among nations, without serving any national need or serving any international purpose of the United States. It further states that the National Committee for Immigration Reform endorses enactment this session of Congress of the essential provisions of the administration's immigration proposal as introduced by myself and 32 other Members of the Senate and by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and a large number of Members of the House.

The impressive list of membership of the committee indicates the widespread citizen support for immigration reform as proposed by the President.

The list includes two former Presidents—Eisenhower and Truman; two former Secretaries of the Treasury—Robert B. Anderson and Douglas Dillon; and two former Attorneys General—Herbert Brownell and J. Howard McGrath. It also includes 19 union presidents, including George Meany, president of the AFL–CIO, and leading religious and civic leaders representing every geographical area of the country.

Yesterday a representative group of the members of the National Committee for Immigration Reform, headed by Gen. David Sarnoff, visited briefly with President Johnson and assured him of their continuing support for the principles of the administration's immigration proposals. There is no doubt that the impressive support evidenced by the formation of this national committee will be one of the more significant reasons for our success in enacting the President's proposals in this session of the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of purpose of the National Committee for Immigration Reform, Mr. Robert Murphy's statement at a news conference held on June 14, and a list of the present membership of the committee be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

The National Committee for Immigration Reform is a voluntary, nonpartisan organization of private citizens dedicated solely to the cause of promoting a fair and nondiscriminatory immigration law. To accomplish this purpose, the committee will work closely with organizations and individuals active in the immigration field to provide information to Congress and the American people and to urge appropriate action.

The present immigration law, enacted in 1952 over a Presidential veto, continues the discriminatory national-origins quota system adopted in the early 1920's. That system allocates annual quotas to countries outside the Western Hemisphere according to the supposed national origins of the American population in 1920, and requires selection of immigrants on the basis of race or ethnic origin. The national-origins system is based upon the statutory presumption that some people are inferior to others solely because of their birth, without regard to their worth.

By discriminating among nations on the basis of birthplace, the national-origins provisions is detrimental to our international interests, breeds hatred and hostility toward the United States, blocks comity among nations, and is a hindrance to our Nation's policy of peace among nations, without serving any national need or serving any international purpose of the United States.

As a device to control immigration by predetermined percentages of national and racial stocks, the national origins system has been a failure. In the entire period since the 1952 law was enacted, only approximately one-third of all aliens admitted to the United States were quota immigrants admitted in accordance with racial or national eligibility. Despite this fact, the entire fabric of our immigration law has been blemished by the discriminatory national origins system.

The last four American Presidents—Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman—have all opposed continuation of the national origins feature of our law. Our last four Secretaries of State—Rusk, Herter, Dulles, and Acheson—have urged that our foreign relations demand a change of the immigration law in this respect. Our last four Attorneys General—Katzenbach, Kennedy, Rogers, and Brownell—also urged Congress to change these discriminatory provisions.

The National Committee for Immigration Reform endorses enactment in this session of Congress of the essential provisions of S. 500 (introduced by Senator HART and 32 other Senators of both parties) and the identical H.R. 2580 (introduced by Congressman CELLER and some 35 other Congressmen of both parties).

These bills would—

1. Abolish the national origins quota system and replace it with an equitable principle of selection on a first-come, first-served basis, within preference categories, subject to a limit of immigration from any one country to 10 percent of the annual total ceiling;

2. Establish a permanent provision for dealing with future refugee emergencies which may arise.

These bills would—

1. Not substantially raise the present authorized ceilings of total immigration to the United States;

2. Not change the present system of priorities based on skills of the prospective immigrants and family reunion;

3. Not change existing health and security qualifications;

4. Not change existing protections for American workers against foreign competition for jobs of Americans.

In short, the major and principal change proposed by these bills is to eliminate selection of immigrants on the basis of ancestry or birthplace and substitute the test of selection based on the immigrant's potential personal contribution to the United States and on the concept of family reunion—standards which are fairer to aliens and more beneficial to Americans.

The National Commmittee for Immigration Reform endorses the essential principles of S. 500 and H.R. 2580. By concentrating our energies and resources on this single task, we hope to aid in focusing public and congressional attention upon this issue and thus secure enactment of a fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory immigration law.

STATEMENT BY MR. ROBERT MURPHY, MEMBER, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM, JUNE 14, 1965, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am both gratified and encouraged by the overwhelmingly favorable response to our letter of invitation to religious, business, labor, and civic leaders to join in support of the basic principles of the administration's immigration reform program.

The letter of invitation, signed by me, was written in behalf of Walker L. Cisler, chairman, Detroit Edison Co.; George Meany, president, AFL–CIO; and David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America. Nathan Straus III, of New York City, has agreed to serve as chairman of the organizing committee.

The full committee now numbers more than 200 members and expressions of support for the committee's goal are still coming in—including support from publishers and heads of other communications media.

I speak with conviction in terms of the need for immigration reform—conviction that it is a three-pronged weapon that can help to wage the peace.

First, it will reveal to the world at large that humanitarianism is a foremost principle in our American tradition. The moral principle involved in family reunion is one in which we believe.

Second, I feel that this long-overdue reform can make an important contribution in our relations with other countries. It can prove to the world that we are determined to ban ethnic and racial bigotry.

Third, it is to our own best self-interest in gaining skills to advance our scientific and technical progress.

President Johnson, in his recent Chicago speech outlining our country's aim to keep the peace, stated: "The consensus within America today is a consensus of courage."

It is difficult for me to believe that any American fears the small numerical increase in immigrants who will come into this country under the administration's proposal. The issue is not one of numbers—the issue is how we bring these people in.

One of the problems we face is the lack of understanding about the proposed immigration reform. And the problem of general public apathy in the face of the minority, but very vocal opposition, which adds to the confusion. It is because of this lack of understanding and misinformation that we felt the need for our committee.

Briefly, the administration's proposal recommends two major changes in the present law: (1) Abolish the national origins quota system and replace it with an equitable principle of selection on a first-come, first-served basis, within preference categories, subject to a limit of immigration from any one country to 10 percent of the annual total ceiling; and (2) establish a permanent provision for dealing with future refugee emergencies which may arise. The proposal was introduced by Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, and has bipartisan support.

The total number of quota immigrants now authorized is 158,000 a year and under the administration's bill it would be about 166,000—an increase of approximately 8,000 a year. Actually, because the bill would authorize the use of quota numbers that now are authorized but unused, it would result in an increase in immigration of about 60,000 a year. This figure is about 2 percent of the present natural increase in our population and obviously can have little practical effect on population growth.

The proposal would not change the present system of priorities based on skills of the prospective immigrants and family reunion. Nor would it change existing health and security qualifications. Nor existing protections for American workers against foreign competition.

Hordes of immigrants will not flood our shores.

Americans will not lose their jobs to foreign competition.

Subversives will not infiltrate our democratic form of Government.

Taxpayers will not be forced to pay the bill for public assistance to unemployed, unskilled or unwilling immigrant workers and their families.

To the contrary, recent history reveals that skilled and professionally trained immigrants can make an important contribution in areas of shortages in this country.

During the 1954–64 period, approximately 36,461 immigrants with engineering training helped to fill this country's needs in this field—more than total the number of engineers receiving degrees in the United States in 1964. During this same 10-year period, there were other fields in which this country realized important gains in what has been called "human capital"—18,424 physicians and surgeons, 36,858 nurses, 6,335 chemists, 1,610 physicists, and 17,209 technicians came to the United States.

The national origins quota system was designed to preserve the balance of national and racial origins as it existed in our country in 1920. Heavily favoring northern European countries, it discriminates against countries of southern and eastern Europe and Asia and Africa. Under this archaic law, 70 percent of the total annual quota is reserved for the United Kingdom, Ireland, and Germany—unfulfilled for many years—the remaining 30 percent shared by more than 100 other countries and areas. Under the present law, western and northern Europe are allotted 82 percent; southern and eastern Europe 16 percent; with only 2 percent for Asia, Africa, and the Pacific area.

Congress has, over the years, enacted special legislation and private bills to help overcome the most blatant injustices. But it has not eliminated the basic problem—the discriminatory and undemocratic selective national origins quota system.

One of the distinguished members of our committee is former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. In calling for an end to the discriminatory treatment accorded immigrants, President Eisenhower in 1960 sent to the Congress a special message in which he said:

"The contributions of successive waves of immigrants show that they do not bring their families to a strange land and learn a new language and a new way of life simply to indulge themselves with comforts.

"The names of those who make important contributions in the field of science, law, and almost every other field of endeavor indicate that there has been no period in which immigrants to this country have not richly regarded it for its liberality in receiving them."

President Kennedy urged similar action by the Congress. President Johnson, in calling on Congress to act, stated:

"In establishing preferences a nation that was built by the immigrants of all lands can ask those who now seek admission: 'What can you do for our country?' But we should not be asking: 'In what country were you born?' "

By concentrating our energies and resources on focusing public and congressional attention on the need for immigration reform, we hope to help secure enactment of a fair, equitable, and nondiscriminatory immigration law.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR IMMIGRATION REFORM [1]

Nathan Straus III, chairman, organizing committee.

Walker L. Cisler, chairman, Detroit Edison Co.

George Meany, president, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International.

David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America.

Gladys Uhl, director of information.

Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Hon. Harry S. Truman.

Hon. Robert Anderson.

Hon. Douglas Dillon.

Hon. Herbert Brownell.

Hon. J. Howard McGrath.

I. W. Abel, president, United Steelworkers of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Harry Akin, president, Night Hawk Restaurants, Austin, Tex.

H. R. Albrecht, president, North Dakota State University, Fargo, N. Dak.

Winthrop W. Aldrich, New York, N.Y.

Stanley C. Allyn, Dayton, Ohio.

Frank Altschul, New York, N.Y.

Mrs. Eugenia Anderson, Red Wing, Minn.

Robert B. Anderson, New York, N.Y.

Albert E. Arent, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Steven Ashcraft, Craft's Drug Stores, Spartanburg, S.C.

Harold L. Bache, New York, N.Y.

Max W. Bay, M.D., Los Angeles, Calif.

Jefferson A. Beaver, San Francisco, Calif.

Robert B. Begley, president, The Begley Drug Co., Richmond, Ky.

J. A. Beirne, president, Communications Workers of America, Washington, D.C.

Mrs. George Bell, Washington, D.C.

Robert S. Benjamin, chairman of the board, United Artists Corp., New York, N.Y.

Dr. John C. Bennett, president, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y.

William Benton, publisher and chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica, New York, N.Y.

Leonard Bernstein, Philharmonic Hall, New York, N.Y.

Hans A. Bethe, Cornell University, Laboratory of Nuclear Studies, Ithaca, N.Y.

Nicholas D. Biddle, New York, N.Y.

Walter H. Bieringer, executive vice president, Plymouth Rubber Co., Inc., Canton, Mass.

Barry Bingham, editor and publisher, The Courier-Journal, Louisville, Ky.

Joseph P. Binns, New York, N.Y.

Rev. Eugene Carson Blake, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jacob Blaustein, Baltimore, Md.

Joseph L. Block, chairman, Inland Steel Co., Chicago, Ill.

Sam R. Bloom, Dallas, Tex.

George M. Bragalini, vice president, Manufacturers Hanover Trust, New York, N.Y.

Harry Brandt, New York, N.Y.

R. James Brennan, Rapid City, S. Dak.

Detlev W. Bronk, president, the Rockefeller Institute, New York, N.Y.

Herbert Brownell, Lord, Day & Lord, New York, N.Y.

George Burdon, president, United Rubber Workers of America, Akron, Ohio.

Cass Canfield, New York, N.Y.

Fred H. Carmichael, Asheville, N.C.

Leo Cherne, executive director, the Research Institute of America, Inc., New York, N.Y.

George L. Chumbley, Jr., vice president, the Battery Park Hotel, Asheville, N.C.

Walker L. Cisler, chairman, the Detroit Edison Co., Detroit, Mich.

[1] Persons included on this list are serving in their individual capacities; where organizational identification is made, it is in each case for the purpose of identification only.

Kenneth B. Clark, Social Dynamics Research Institute, City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Abram Claude, Jr., vice president, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y.

Gen. Lucius Clay, New York, N.Y.

Jacob Clayman, IUD–AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C.

Ben Cohen, Washington, D.C.

Henry Commager, Amherst College, Amherst, Mass.

Donald C. Cook, president, American Electric Power Co., New York, N.Y.

Thomas M. Cooley II, dean, University of Pittsburgh School of Law, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Edward Corsi, New York, N.Y.

Glenn M. Coulter, Detroit, Mich.

Norman Cousins, Saturday Review of Literature, New York, N.Y.

Gardner Cowles, chairman of the board and editor in chief, Cowles Magazines & Broadcasting, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harry B. Cunningham, president, S. S. Kresge Co., Detroit, Mich.

Joseph Curran, president, National Maritime Union of America, New York, N.Y.

Edward L. Cushman, vice president, American Motors Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Most Reverend Richard Cardinal Cushing, Boston, Mass.

J. de Cubas, president, Westinghouse Electric International, New York, N.Y.

Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., New York, N.Y.

Fred DelliQuadri, dean, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Hon. Douglas Dillon, New York, N.Y.

Dr. John S. Dickey, president, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H.

Carling Dinkler, Jr., chairman of the board, Dinkler Hotel Corp., Atlanta, Ga.

Morgan J. Doughton, chairman, Managerial Dynamics, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Horace W. B. Donegan, bishop of New York, New York, N.Y.

Lewis W. Douglas, New York, N.Y.

R. E. Driscoll, Jr., Kellar & Kellar & Driscoll, Lead, S. Dak.

David Dubinsky, president, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, New York, N.Y.

Allen W. Dulles, Washington, D.C.

Herbert B. Ehrmann, Boston, Mass.

Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Cong., New York, N.Y.

Milton L. Elsberg, president, Drug Fair, Alexandria, Va.

George M. Elsey, Washington, D.C.

Everett H. Erlick, vice president and general counsel, American Broadcasting-Paramount Theaters, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Luther H. Evans, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

James A. Farley, chairman, Coca Cola Export Corp., New York, N.Y.

James E. Faust, attorney at law, Salt Lake City, Utah.

William J. Feldstein, Milwaukee, Wis.

Mrs. Laura Fermi, Chicago, Ill.

E. H. Foley, Corcoran, Foley, Youngman & Rowe, Washington, D.C.

Frank M. Folsom, chairman of the executive committee, Radio Corp. of America, New York, N.Y.

Marion B. Folsom, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N.Y.

John B. Ford III, Detroit, Mich.

Berent Friele, New York, N.Y.

Jack Fruchtman, 114 West Lexington Street, Baltimore, Md.

Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Buell G. Gallagher, president, the City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Sylvester J. Garamella, New York, N.Y.

Gen. James M. Gavin, chairman, Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.

Bruce A. Gimbel, president, Gimbel Bros., Inc., New York, N.Y.

Harry Golden, the Carolina Israelite, Charlotte, N.C.
Eric F. Goldman, special consultant to the President, the White House, Washington, D.C.
Samuel Goldwyn, Los Angeles, Calif.
William P. Gray, Gray, Pfaelzer & Robertson, Los Angeles, Calif.
Arnold S. Gregory, Danville, Ky.
John J. Grogan, president, Industrial Union of Marine Workers, Camden, N.J.
Harry E. Gould, New York, N.Y.
Mason W. Gross, president, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.
Gen. Alfred Gruenther, Washington, D.C.
Paul Hall, president, the Seafarers International Union, Brooklyn, N.Y.
James Hamilton, National Council of Churches, Washington, D.C.
Oscar Handlin, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
John W. Hanes, Jr., New York, N.Y.
John A. Hannah, president, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.
Marion Harper, Jr., New York, N.Y.
George M. Harrison, chief executive officer, Brotherhood of Railway & Steamship Clerks, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Thomas B. Harvey, Philadelphia, Pa.
John C. Hazen, vice president, National Retail Merchants Association, Washington, D.C.
August Heckscher, New York, N.Y.
Ben W. Heineman, chairman, Chicago & North Western Railway Co., Chicago, Ill.
Ernest Henderson, chairman, Sheraton Corp. of America, Boston, Mass.
Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC president, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.
Miss Jane M. Hoey, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Anna Rosenberg Hoffman, New York, N.Y.
Sidney Hollander, Baltimore, Md.
Mrs. Hiram Cole Houghton, Iowa City, Iowa.
Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher, the Denver Post, Denver, Colo.
Archbishop Iakovas, New York, N.Y.
Paul Jennings, president, Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, Washington, D.C.
Devereux C. Josephs, New York, N.Y.
J. M. Kaplan, New York, N.Y.
Jerome J. Keating, president, National Association of Letter Carriers, Washington, D.C.
Joseph D. Keenan, international secretary, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Washington, D.C.
Herman Kenin, president, American Federation of Musicians, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Clark Kerr, president, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Mrs. Marcus Kilch, president, National Council of Catholic Women, Washington, D.C.
Robert C. Kirkwood, chairman, F. W. Woolworth Co., New York, N.Y.
Robert Huntington Knight, Sherman & Sterling, New York, N.Y.
Alfred A. Knopf, Purchase, N.Y.
David Lloyd Kreeger, president, Government Employees Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.
Arthur B. Krim, president, United Artists Corp., New York, N.Y.
Most Reverend John Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia.
C. B. Larsen, chairman, executive committee, Cunningham Drug Stores, Inc., Detroit, Mich.
Sidney Lawrence, director, Community Relations Bureau, Kansas City, Mo.
Ralph Lazarus, president, Federated Department Stores, Cincinnati, Ohio.
K. G. Lee, the Chinese Journal, New York, N.Y.
Robert Lehman, Lehman Bros., New York, N.Y.
Samuel D. Leidesdorf, New York, N.Y.
Sid B. Levine, Beverly Hills, Calif.
D. M. Lilly, Toro Manufacturing Corp., Minneapolis, Minn.
Sol M. Linowitz, chairman, Xerox Corp., Rochester, N.Y.
Mrs. Clair Booth Luce, Phoenix, Ariz.
Henry R. Luce, Phoenix, Ariz.
L. C. Lustenberger, president, W. T. Grant Co., New York, N.Y.
Florence Mahoney, Washington, D.C.
Julius Manger, Jr., chairman, Manger Hotels Cos., New York, N.Y.
Stanley Marcus, Neiman-Marcus, Dallas, Tex.
Judge Juvenal Marchisio, New York, N.Y.
George M. Mardikian, San Francisco, Calif.
Luis Muñoz Marín, San Juan, P.R.
Rev. Dr. Julius Mark, Congregation Emanu-El, New York, N.Y.
Woodrow D. Marriott, Marriott-Hot Shoppes, Inc., Washington, D.C.
Joseph Martin, Jr., San Francisco, Calif.
John McCarthy, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D.C.
Paul M. McCloskey, Jr., McCloskey, Wilson, Mosher & Martin, Palo Alto, Calif.
Ralph McGill, publisher, Atlanta Constitution, Atlanta, Ga.
J. Howard McGrath, Washington, D.C.
John J. McGrath, Allied Stores Corp., New York, N.Y.
Most Reverend Archbishop, McIntyre, Los Angeles, Calif.
Samuel W. Meek, New York, N.Y.
Dr. William C. Menninger, The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.
Yehudi Menuhin, London, England.
Mrs. Helen Kirkpatric Milbank, Marlboro, N.H.
Howard Moore, Jr., Atlanta, Ga.
Arturo Morales-Carrion, Pan American Union, Washington, D.C.
Edward P. Morgan, Washington, D.C.
Teodoro Moscoso, chairman, executive committee, Banco De Ponce, Santurce, P.R.
Robert Moses, New York, N.Y.
Robert Murphy, chairman, Corning Glass International, New York, N.Y.
John Courtney Murray, S. J., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
Most Reverend Archbishop O'Boyle, Washington, D.C.
James E. O'Brien, Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, San Francisco, Calif.
Roderick L. O'Connor, vice president, CIBA Corp., Fair Lawn, N.J.
Robert S. Oelman, chairman, the National Cash Register Co., Dayton, Ohio.
Frederick O'Neal, president, Actors Equity Association, New York, N.Y.
John Ottaviano, Jr., supreme venerable, New Haven, Conn.
Dr. H. A. Overstreet, Falls Church, Va.
Mrs. H. A. Overstreet, Falls Church, Va.
William S. Paley, chairman, Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, N.Y.
James G. Patton, president, National Farmers Union, Washington, D.C.
Mrs. Malcolm E. Peabody, Cambridge, Mass.
Drew Pearson, Washington, D.C.
Roland Pierotti, executive vice president, Bank of America, San Francisco, Calif.
Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, San Francisco, Calif.
Phillip W. Pillsbury, chairman of the board, the Pillsbury Co., Minneapolis, Minn.
William Pollack, general president, Textile Workers Union of America, New York, N.Y.
Fortune Pope, publisher, Il Progresso, New York, N.Y.
Jacob S. Potofsky, general president, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, New York, N.Y.
George D. Pratt, Jr., Bridgewater, Conn.
Maxwell M. Rabb, New York, N.Y.
Dr. I. S. Ravdin, University Hospital, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dr. James M. Read, Wilmington College, Wilmington, Ohio
Walter P. Reuther, president, United Auto Workers International Union, Detroit, Mich.
Irving G. Rhodes, the Wisconsin Jewish Chronicle, Milwaukee, Wis.
Emil Rieve, Hollywood, Fla.
David Rockefeller, New York, N.Y.
Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, chairman of the board, Trenton Trust Co., Trenton, N.J.
Harry N. Rosenfield, attorney, Washington, D.C.
Lessing J. Rosenwald, Jenkintown, Pa.
William Rosenwald, New York, N.Y.
Pierre Salinger, Beverly Hills, Calif.
Dr. Jonas Salk, San Diego, Calif.
Howard J. Samuels, president, Kordite Corp., Macedon, N.Y.
Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman, Radio Corp. of America, New York, N.Y.
Stuart T. Saunders, chairman of board, the Pennsylvania Railroad, Philadelphia, Pa.
Dore Schary, New York, N.Y.
Harry Scherman, Book of the Month Club, Inc., New York, N.Y.
Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Washington, D.C.
Charles H. Schneider, editor, Memphis Press-Scimitar, Memphis, Tenn.
Jack Sheehan, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.
Mrs. Harper Sibley, Rochester, N.Y.
Norton Simon, Fullerton, Calif.
Ross D. Siragusa, chairman of the board, Admiral Corp., Chicago, Ill.
William B. Spann, Jr., Auston Miller & Gaines, Atlanta, Ga.
Philip Sporn, chairman, American Electric Power Co., Inc., New York, N.Y.
Gen. Carl A. Spaatz, USAF, retired, Chevy Chase, Md.
Ceslovas Staniulis, president, American Lithuanian Engineers Association, Inc., Dearborn, Mich.
Philip M. Stern, Washington, D.C.
Mark C. Stevens, vice president, Detroit Bank & Trust, Detroit, Mich.
Alan M. Stroock, New York, N.Y.
Walter S. Surrey, Washington, D.C.
Benjamin H. Swig, chairman, Fairmont Hotel, San Francisco, Calif.
Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio.
Dr. Edward Teller, University of California, Livermore, Calif.
Dr. Paul Tillich, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Maynard J. Toll, O'Melveny & Meyers, Los Angeles, Calif.
Ben Touster, New York, N.Y.
Hon. Harry S. Truman, Independence, Mo.
Maxwell M. Upson, New York, N.Y.
William J. vanden Heuvel, Washington, D.C.
Frank J. Vodrazka, president, Czechoslovak Society of America, Cicero, Ill.
Thomas J. Watson, Jr., chairman, IBM, New York, N.Y.
Sidney J. Weinberg, Goldman, Sachs & Co., New York, N.Y.
Edwin L. Weisl, Sr., New York, N.Y.
Edwin J. Wesely, New York, N.Y.
Dr. Gilbert F. White, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.
Dr. Paul Dudley White, Boston, Mass.
Edward S. Wikera, M.D., Dearborn, Mich.
Harvey Williams, president, the Company for Investing Abroad, Philadelphia, Pa.
Stanley Woodward, Washington, D.C.
Jerry Wurf, international president, American Federation of State, County & Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C.
James K. Zotolas, New York, N.Y.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

ADDITIONAL BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. MORSE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (S. 2160) to amend section 305 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 with respect to the disposition of proprietary rights in inventions made thereunder, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LONG of Louisiana in the chair). If there is no further business to come before the Senate, under the previous order, the Senate will now stand adjourned until Monday, at 12 o'clock noon.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Monday, June 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 17, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Frederick Joseph Brown, XXXXXX, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It Couldn't Be Done

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker:

Somebody said that it couldn't be done,
But he with a chuckle replied
That "maybe it couldn't," but he would be one
Who wouldn't say so till he'd tried.

Edgar Guest could well have had David Bell in mind when he penned those lines.

Because, that is what they were saying about the foreign aid program when David Bell took it over on December 21, 1962. They were saying that foreign aid could not continue to work, that it would be a waste of taxpayers money, that although it had succeeded as the Marshall plan in Europe, it could not succeed in the newly emerging and developing countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

David Bell heard all these stories, but he refused to believe that it would not work before he tried.

Well, today, foreign aid is working—all over the world:

In Taiwan, where our economic assistance will come to an end this month because the Taiwanese are now able to go it alone.

In India, where industrial production has increased 110 percent since 1951.

In Chile, where aid-assisted savings and loan associations with 84,000 members and $48 million in savings, are providing the capital for a thriving housing industry and opening the door to decent housing for thousands of middle lower income families.

In Thailand, where nearly one-fifth of the entire budget has been earmarked for education, and the literacy rate has been raised to 70 percent.

In Jordan, where foreign exchange earnings increased from $8 million in 1959 to $22 million in 1964.

In Pakistan, where the gross national product has risen about 5 percent a year and the per capita increase has been over 2 percent a year since 1960.

In Korea, where between 1958 and 1963, power production increased 50 percent.

In Vietnam, where some 35,000 farm families have benefited from a self-supporting pig-raising problem which has given villages a new source of cash income.

In Upper Volta, where a U.S.-supported measles campaign saved the lives of hundreds of thousands of children in the space of a few months.

In Nigeria, where AID-financed teams from 11 American universities are working to reshape the entire educational system.

And foreign aid is working in other countries, too, because David Bell has insisted on self-help and local participation as a requisite for our aid.

I would like to join with my colleagues in saluting David Bell for his refusal to say that "it couldn't be done."

We are all better off because he tried—and is still trying.

Independence Day of Kuwait

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 17, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, on the northern shores of the Persian Gulf, there lies a small and intensely interesting state which this Saturday, June 19, will celebrate the fourth anniversary of its independence—Kuwait.

I want to take this opportunity, therefore, to extend warm and personal felicitations to His Highness Abdulla al-Salim al-Sabah, the ruler of Kuwait; and His Excellency Talat al-Ghoussein, the Kuwaiti Ambassador to the United States.

In the short space of time since the end of World War II, Kuwait has grown from a small British principality, dependent upon pearl fishing, boatbuilding, and entrepot trade, to an independent state whose immense oil revenues and progressive policies have given it a much larger role in the economic affairs of the Middle East than its modest geographical dimensions and population might indicate.

Despite the meager historical records of the gulf, it has become increasingly apparent in recent years that the region is not without an impressive past. Excavations by Danish and other archeologists have disclosed that the island of Failaka, located in Kuwait Bay, contains two different settlements of considerable interest. The first dates from about the middle of the third millenium B.C. and indicates that the island and surrounding area was an important trading center of the ancient world; the second, dated about the second century B.C., has brought Greek statuettes and other remnants to light—including a tablet addressed to the people of the island by one of Alexander the Great's generals—indicating a significant Greek settlement.

Quite naturally, the advent of Islam was the next most important event in Kuwaiti history, and one of the most important battles in early Muslim history was fought near the modern city of Kuwait. Nevertheless, Kuwait's lack of water meant that for centuries it could only support a small population, and it was little heard from.

The discovery of oil in 1934, however, radically changed the economy as well as the way of life of the people of Kuwait. As a result of World War II, this tremendous natural resource was not exploited until the late 1940's, but the progress which this small nation has made since that time by wise use of the revenues obtained, on the other hand, staggers the imagination.

The wealth obtained from oil has immensely stimulated trade, led to the development of an incredible number of new industries, as well as one of the most comprehensive and extensive programs of economic and social development ever undertaken by a single country.

It is undoubtedly the latter of which the Kuwaitis are most proud, and justifiably so. Rather than squandering its resources, the Government immediately undertook to provide Kuwaitis with many of the social services and modern facilities which they had not been able to afford earlier. It established some of the most modern hospitals in the world,